

THE CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. VII.—OCTOBER, 1867.—No. 38.

ARTICLE I.

THE PREACHERS FOR THE TIMES AND THEIR TRAINING.

CHRISTIANITY casts contempt on all human wisdom and power. That which to human reason is forever impossible it accomplishes by agencies which reason pronounces foolishness and weakness, and that not in contempt, but in all sincerity. According to all the decisions of human reason, Christianity *is* foolishness and weakness, as the overthrow of Jericho by the blowing of rams' horns was foolishness to the military science of Julius Cæsar and Charlemagne.

The first Christian preachers were regarded by the world of philosophy either with a proud indifference or with ineffable scorn. They were babblers, fools, madmen; only deemed worthy of notice when they stirred up the common people, and so were inconvenient; and then to be put out of the way like other fools and madmen, by the scourge, the prison, or the public executioner.

When Christ said: "Lift up your eyes and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest," what did he mean? Was the world sick of its idolatries, disgusted with its blind guides, convinced of its own foolishness, and ready to welcome the preachers of the Gospel? No! Its delirium was at the height. The recoil of its sated passions was still

followed by increased devotion to all the gods of its idolatry. Learning, philosophy, eloquence, art, were panders to its pride, handmaids to its licentiousness. Its very despair of deliverance from the miserable thraldom of evil was an incentive to the wilder rage of its lusts, its still more reckless transgression of law. It was a moral chaos, inconceivably more dreadful than that on which darkness sat in the primeval day, and to all human view more hopeless. With all that human reason could accomplish, the world was on the verge of utter destruction.

Then were the fields white already to harvest. A better theatre there could not be for Christianity to display its power. Now shall it be seen, that the foolishness of God is wiser than men ; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. The greatest and best of the Greek philosophers has utterly failed in his most strenuous endeavors to win the young men of Athens to the practice of sobriety. The voice of the Christian preacher is lifted up, and lo, the power of evil is suddenly and strangely broken ; chains, which had seemed of adamant, snap asunder and fall off; the votaries of debasing passion, transformed by an unseen, mighty power, turn away in disgust from that which is evil, and walk in the image of God. The darkness which has long brooded so disastrously over the whole face of human society is rolled back, and in many a humble village and many a proud and voluptuous capital, throughout the Roman Empire, that is fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet : "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."

There is but one possible conclusion from this ; and it is, that the Christian pulpit is the great power of God for the regeneration of human society, and that all possible or conceivable obstacles are so many foils to its triumphs ; since it is in its very nature and design, that it should shut the mouths of lions, quench the violence of fire, subdue kingdoms, pluck up mountains and cast them into the depths of the sea.

Is it supposed that the Christian pulpit has already achieved its greatest triumphs, because the world is no longer arrayed in open hostility to the Gospel ? Since Christianity has been taken under its patronage, and Christ admitted to a seat among the gods many and lords many of its Pantheon, is the Christian

preacher therefore to conclude that now he has only to travel at ease over the leveled and smooth highway of the King to receive his crown?

A graver mistake there could not be. The hostility of the world to Jesus Christ has not ceased. Its manifestation may be changed, its spirit is ever the same. A glance at the present aspects of the Christian world will make it plain that there has been no day in which there existed greater necessity for the preacher to take unto him the whole armor of God, and gird himself for earnest, uncompromising warfare. The evils with which he must contend are manifold, subtle, and fraught with deepest peril. We may note, as one of these,

Indifference to Christian doctrine. This is an evil of far greater magnitude than the teaching of positive error. If the inspiration of the Bible, or the proper Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, is assailed openly, there is nothing to fear. The result can only be the confirmation of the truth. But when some grand article of the faith is simply left out, men slumber, and its foundations are loosened. If the main pillars of a house are wanting, the house can not stand. Without completeness of doctrine, the entire fabric of Christianity must be weakened, if it does not fall. Even Luther's *articulum stantis vel cadentis ecclesie*, justification by faith, when separated from the principle of daily obedience to Christ, as Lord of the church, runs into religious sentimentalism or antinomian delusion. The grand symbols of Christian doctrine are not the productions of cold speculative men, smitten with a passion to reduce all things to logical form; but the statement of the truth of God as wrought into the profound convictions of spiritual men, and demanded, in stormy periods, to strengthen the heart of the faithful, or resist the assaults of infidels. Augustine and John Calvin were not more distinguished for clear, massive intellect, and brilliancy of genius, than for warm affections, and exalted communion with God.

Closely allied with indifference to Christian doctrine, is a rationalistic temper, the deification of human reason.

The rationalists are men of progress. Creeds and dogmas, which to illustrious Christian Fathers have been as the armor of God, are no more to them than cerements of the long dead.

It is their high prerogative to see truth as God sees it, directly; and whatever is not clearly and indisputably true to their spiritual vision—the reason or intuitional consciousness—they reject, even though God himself should seem to declare it. The Bible is a revelation, or, at least contains a revelation, and Christianity is true: but not a single fact or doctrine is to be accepted as truth because the Bible in direct terms asserts it. The reason is supreme, infallible judge. To suppose that God, who created the human reason, should reveal to that reason mysteries of faith, to be implicitly received, though impossible to be understood until seen in the light of eternity, is held to be a pitiable weakness or fanaticism. Thus a full and sufficient cause for the rejection of the doctrine of original sin, or the trinity, or the atonement, or regeneration, or justification, or the resurrection, or future punishment, is found in the fact that man's reason pronounces it absurd.

This is rationalism, in its temper and essential elements, however it may seek to hide itself under a professed reverence for God and his revelations.

We note also, as one of the prominent characteristics of the age, a tendency to exalt man. We do not mean by this a disposition to lift him up from his degradation and guilt, in a conformity with God's gracious plan, but rather to set a crown on the head of fallen humanity, ignoring the sad fact of its fall, its debasement, its ever-accumulating ill-desert and misery; investing this fallen, debased humanity with rights and immunities which trench on the prerogatives of God. It is not because man was made in the image of God, and is still dear to the heart of God; not that Christ came to redeem and restore. Of God and Jesus Christ this spirit of the age takes little note. Neither is it to a humanity redeemed from what is low and earthly, and lifted up to the highest moral and intellectual strength and beauty of which man is capable, that its homage is accorded—man fitted to command respect, to determine questions, to be, in human society, as the head among the members; to rule. Of principalities and powers and prerogatives it is intensely jealous. It denies their right. It refuses its reverence. It demolishes the Corinthian pillar; it breaks rudely the polished mirror; it profanes the beautiful temple.

Humanity is the object of its reverence, the god of its worship. It speaks great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration, because of advantage. It tramples on authority ; its own will is law ; it dethrones God and revels in a practical atheism, uprooting, in the end, and by an inevitable rule of sequence, all the foundations of order, and debasing itself, even unto hell.

There is a disposition in the spirit of the age, to put philanthropy above the Gospel. The apostles were not schoolmasters. They preached the Gospel, and when men were converted, however rude and ignorant, even the most abject slaves of pagan masters, they gathered them into churches and gave them ordinances of Christian worship. That made the first Christian preachers the greatest civilizing power which the world ever saw ; though civilization, let it forever be remembered, was not the object which they sought, but the spiritual renovation of men. This was the divine method, and the result was a countless multitude of souls washed from their sins and saved forever. The wisdom of the present day has changed all this. The multiplication table is better than the ten commandments ; mechanical skill is before morality ; the schoolmaster takes precedence of the preacher, liberty is above salvation. It is a fatal mistake, in any point of view, as all history shows. The Jesuits were a mighty power for good, so long as they kept close to the original design of the order, and preached. Whole communities were reformed in an incredibly short space of time. The intrepid Francis Xavier, in the ten years of his apostleship, "planted the faith in fifty two kingdoms, preached the Gospel through nine thousand miles of territory, and baptized more than a million persons." But when they sought for themselves chairs in the schools of theology, and made alliance with princes, and contended with the Sorbonne, and aimed to extend the influence of their order by secular plans and agencies, their glory departed.

Another peculiar feature of the religious world in our day is, an increasing demand for brilliant orations on the Sabbath, in stead of simple Gospel sermons, and musical performance in the place of worship. "My house shall be called the house of prayer for all nations," said Christ ; and both Christ and his

apostles stood up on the Sabbath to preach repentance to the people, to rebuke their sins, to excite their fears; not to please their taste, and win their admiration. How are men to be saved if the pulpit is changed to the tribune, and worship is perfunctory; or if Massillon and Bourdaloue are the preacher's models, in stead of Wycliffe and Hugh Latimer and Richard Baxter?

It is hardly to be considered a step further in the same direction, when men run a church as they run a lyceum. The case is only too common at the present time. It is the operation of a law of political economy in religious things. The supply is suited to the demand. A fine orator in the place of the Christian preacher ministers delight, and so long as his theme, or at least his text, is taken from the Bible, however far away his conclusions may be from Bible conclusions, men easily persuade themselves that they are religious in going to hear him, and so they are willing to pay, and the enterprise is a success, albeit no place is found for the poor in the pews, and little Gospel is heard from the pulpit.

The building of splendid churches for the rich and fashionable is another marked tendency of the age. If it were a disposition to honor Christ by bringing rich gifts to his altar, that would be well. The Lord accepts with approval the most costly offerings of a love which delights to bring the best of all that which is already his own; whether it be the alabaster box of very precious ointment, or the goodly stones and golden vessels of the temple. He sees through the hypocrisy and cant which erects a mean house for him, and then seeks to cover up the meanness under the name of Christian simplicity. But how much better is it, when a swelling pride lavishes its wealth in the erection of magnificent edifices, not that the rich and poor may meet together there, and Christ, to whom both are equally dear, may be honored in their comely fellowship of praise, but for vanity and self-aggrandizement? Such a process may seem to save to the ranks of a denomination the votaries of fashion and elegance and polite culture; but it is too sure a sign that spiritual life is departing.

The absence of the true spirit of Christian fellowship is an element of weakness in the piety of the present day. This,

assuredly, is not a matter to be regulated by the customs of society. "As I have loved you," are the terms which Christ employs to define the duty of his people to each other. Such language means *something*. In him it was a *flame*, which many waters could not quench, nor floods drown. Has the obligation ceased? Is the law abrogated? Was it meant only for the primitive ages, or for days of persecution? Does Jesus Christ attach less value to his people's love for one another, and its appropriate manifestation now, than when he was himself on the earth? Or is it any less required, as an argument for the truth of Christianity, when infidelity, in new and most subtle disguises, is laboring everywhere for the subversion of the faith? If the spirit of conventionalism reigns with as supreme a sway in the church as in the world, and if the fellowship of those whom Christ has redeemed and separated for his service is to be regulated by social affinities, and earthly distinctions in rank and condition, then it is high time that one give us a new exposition of the old law, and tell us what advantage in this respect Christianity has above paganism.

It may sound strange to hear it said that the Lord Jesus Christ has not the place to which he is entitled in the views of the Orthodox at the present day: nevertheless we affirm it, and in this fact we find the germ of all the evils at which we have glanced. It is not enough that Christ be the central point in our creeds, to be folded up and laid away; not enough, that we see him dimly, in his person, his offices, his teaching, through the mists and shadows of eighteen centuries. This is not according to truth. He is present with his church to-day. He comes to us, as it were, from the sorrows of his cross. He talks to us of those sorrows; their dreadful necessity, their transcendent results. He gives us doctrines fresh from his lips, and the lips of inspired men. He binds us, by an oath of allegiance, a covenant sealed with blood, to his service. He gives us ordinances and sacraments, to be most religiously observed; he constitutes us depositaries of his truth, and witnesses for his name, to the men of this generation. Our whole life is to be ruled by a supreme regard to his will, an unutterable gratitude for his love, the spirit of implicit obedience to his commands; as though he had but now left the earth, still

stained with his blood, and might return again to-morrow. Do the heart and life of the church answer to this?

And now what, in view of these peculiar characteristics of the age, is the province of the Christian pulpit? We answer, that it be true to its high commission. That commission is directly from the Lord Jesus Christ, and is simple, well-defined, and clear. "Preach the Gospel!" The Gospel is the same which was preached in the beginning, and admits no change so long as the great facts of God and human depravity and redemption are the same. God is dreadful in his majesty, perfect in his holiness, strict and immutable in his justice, the supreme and only Law-giver and King to the intelligent universe. Man is fallen and utterly depraved, full of all wickedness and madness, in a most determined rebellion against God, under a condemnation declared and irrevocable; and absolutely hopeless in his misery. Christ, the Divine-human, the God-man, in fulfilment of an eternal covenant with the Father, has made atonement by his death, has suffered the penalty of human guilt, has satisfied, to the last tittle, the demands of justice, and so has solved the problem of infinite difficulty—how God can be just in justifying the ungodly. Thus salvation, full and free, is offered to all, on condition of repentance and faith. Man, in the pride of his heart, treats the offer with indifference, or with contempt. The Holy Spirit, by an operation of sovereignty and grace, subdues the will and changes the heart of those whom God will save; all the rest are incorrigible in sin, and perish forever.

This is the old Gospel, with its related facts and truths. To deny that the Bible teaches it, is flagrantly to violate all the laws of human language, and to make language an impossible vehicle for the communication of truth. To keep it back, or to modify it, under pretence of philosophical adaptation and the conciliation of human pride, is to incur the triple guilt of treason to the Lord Jesus Christ, complicity with rebellion, and eternal death to human souls.

This has been the faith of the church and the armor of God in all the ages. Paul and his coadjutors the apostles preached it, and the strongholds of sin fell everywhere before them, in an age when philosophy and eloquence and poetry and art

were in impious league with a universal voluptuousness and rejection of God. This made Claude of Turin mightier than the thunders which reverberated along the valleys of his native Alps, when all his contemporaries wore the badge of the woman in scarlet. With this, Martin Luther carried stronger gates than those of Gaza, and opened the spiritual Bastile of dark ages, that imprisoned souls might come forth. Wycliffe and Knox and Hugh Latimer and Whitefield made impious Belshazzars tremble at the hand-writing on the wall, sent dismay to the heart of Satan, and filled heaven with joy over countless multitudes of repenting sinners, only because they were armed in this panoply of God.

This old Gospel the modern preacher is required to proclaim, in the exercise of a simple reliance on the mighty power of the Spirit of God. Without it, his life must be a mournful failure. The multitude may be charmed by his eloquence, and may loudly applaud his fancied wisdom: but not one sinner will ever be saved by his doctrine. He may as soon heal a leper or raise the dead by the sound of a lute or the fragrance of flowers.

At the same time that we claim for the Christian pulpit that it must remain unchanged through all the ages in its essential features, we affirm, with almost equal earnestness, that it must adapt itself to the peculiar character of every age, and each particular community. This is common sense, the wisdom of the serpent, sound philosophy, in relation to the things of the kingdom of God. So Paul was made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some. Paul at Athens preaching, and Paul in a synagogue of the Jews at Thessalonica, was quite another man. But how another? Not that in either case he substituted speculations, conceits, dogmas, dialectics, for the truth of the Gospel. Not he; but he suited himself to his audience, in his selection of weapons from the divine armory, and in his method of assault. With the Jews, his starting point was their own acknowledged Scriptures: with those acute, yet pagan philosophers on Mars Hill, an inscription on one of their altars of religious worship. The conclusion in either case was alike irresistible, and the result in both substantially the same. Some believed; and as for the rest, the Jews,

impulsive, bigoted, and unbelieving, got up a mob and made an assault; while the philosophic Athenians, unbelieving also, wrapped themselves about with the dignity of ineffable scorn, and mocked.

There are two faults in our day, which lie on either side of the course pursued by Paul. The one is that of the men who affect a peculiar wisdom in the adaptation of their ministry to the age, and find such adaptation in softening, or modifying, or dropping out of view altogether, the old and offensive doctrines of the cross. Every thing is shadowy and indistinct. A mist is over all the landscape. God's revelation becomes vague and unintelligible. Not even men as trees walking do we discern; and what we took for mountains on their everlasting foundations, and rivers, and lakes, and mighty waves of the sea, and temples and towers of a great city, in God's glorious sunlight, is all a deceptive, mocking mirage. There is wisdom still, but it is found in a universal doubting and darkness and uncertainty. Paul, with his certitudes and positiveness and strong asseverations, would find himself altogether behind these times.

These are the paganizing preachers. They come to us with old darkness, and, with a wonderful simplicity, expect us to receive it as new light. They put all the candles of the tabernacle under bushels, or into lanterns, so that one can not distinguish a man from a brazen altar.

We have said there are two mistakes of the pulpit at the present day. The other is that of those who hold fast the old doctrines, and preach them with all the decision of a profound and rooted conviction, but with little power to compel the attention of an intensely materialistic and sensuous age. They are as honest as Paul, and as fearless; but they have not Paul's masterly skill in the great Gospel warfare. They stand still, in their consecrated temples, and utter the old oracles in the old way, while the world without goes rushing madly by, not knowing that they are there. They are right in their theology, but wrong in their tactics; orthodox, but not philosophical. If the age was serious and earnest, and would go up to the house of God from fixed habit and traditional popular sentiment, then the oracle might utter itself within the walls of its temple, clad in the robes of its proper dignity, and its influ-

ence would be felt and acknowledged afar. But the grand problem for the preacher of the age is, how to arrest and hold the attention of a pleasure-loving, irreverent, atheistical generation, and to do it in a legitimate way; in other words, to compel the attention of men to the old and unwelcome truths, which the men of every age have hated to hear, and in a time when the externals of the Gospel awaken small respect; when mere official dignity goes for nothing, if not even for less than nothing; when there is a strong and growing disposition to challenge and profane things which the fathers of this generation held as reverend and sacred. We must not shut our eyes to the fact that this is a great and a very difficult achievement. Neither, on the other hand, must we set it down as an achievement impossible to be accomplished.

The thing demanded is, that the preacher of Christ's Gospel exhibit the same broad common sense and keen sagacity and fertility of expedients and indomitable will, in his own particular line of things, which are every where seen in all other departments of human skill and enterprise. He must command the respect of his generation; must be a master in intelligence and tact and prudence and the power of adaptation. Paul was all that, or his ministry, with all the strength of his giant intellect, and all his varied learning, would have been, comparatively, a failure. If any man thinks that, because he has been duly qualified, according to established and venerable routine, has been properly accredited and received all the stamps of his professional career, therefore the men of this age will stand up and do him reverence, or even listen to his message, it is a mistake, and the sooner he becomes a fool that he may be wise, the better. He must be willing to put himself, in this respect, on a level with men in the secular professions; men at the bar, on the platform, in the senate. No man expects to be listened to there on account of his credentials. All the honors of all the universities can not help him, and there could not be found a court-room or deliberative assembly of modern days that would not laugh him to scorn if he dared assert the smallest claim based on any such qualifications. He knows this, and accepts the conditions: and more, he knows that the strongest batteries of criticism and satire and sarcasm are

planted against him when he takes the field, and if he can not stand before them, he must fall.

What we assert is, that the temper of the present age will subject the preacher to much the same rough, yet healthful ordeal. And we say, that if, having the armory of God from which to draw his weapons, having the everlasting Gospel, whose proclamation was the glory and strength and triumph of the angel of the Apocalypse; if, having these, and, back of them, the credentials of God and the promised aid of the Holy Spirit, he can not arrest and compel the attention even of the men of this arrogant and irreverent age, then he deserves to fail. There is no sufficient reason, human or divine, why a preacher should not fight his way to success through all the obstacles which lie in the path of any other man. It is effeminacy and cowardice and pitiful cant to claim for him a special dispensation.

Such is the ministry which the circumstances require. How is it to be secured? Two things are necessary. First the right men. God provides these. A preacher is a creation. That which constitutes his marvellous power came with him when he came into the world. It is the power by which a man moves other men by speech, making them see with his eyes, and hear with his ears, and feel what he feels: a more wonderful thing to do, some one has said, than to dance amid a thousand red hot ploughshares blindfold, and not be burned. God furnishes such men in every age. To doubt it would be to impugn his wisdom in the providential government of the world, and to assert that the Lord Jesus Christ has less regard for the peculiar needs of his own redeemed church than for the relief of men's wants through the exercise of natural gifts in the mechanic arts. Yet is not the number of such men large in any age. The churches of New England are paying the penalty to-day of the mistake into which they fell in the revivals of thirty years ago; that of pressing every converted young man into the ministry, without pausing to inquire whether God meant him for a minister. This error has wrought much mischief. It has robbed the community of not a few good farmers, mechanics and tradesmen; and, peradventure, of merchant princes, physicians, lawyers. Moreover, it has kept a

very worthy class of men poor and discontented and miserable, through their undertaking the duties of a calling for which God never designed them. This evil has been aggravated, and the discontent and misery of these men intensified, by the severe censures heaped upon them because they, good men and Christians, have not kindled and glowed on the great themes of God and judgment and eternity, when there was no fire in them to kindle on any thing. They have been fain to make reprisals, by accusing the churches of a wicked fastidiousness, simply because they could not be enamored of dulness, try they never so hard. By an inevitable reaction, again, the churches, wearied with coldness and deadness and platitudes, and thirsting for a pulpit ministration that can stir their emotions, have been too ready to accept the natural endowment without the spiritual grace ; and unconverted fluency has carried it against converted dulness in the preacher ; and Christ has been dishonored and his doctrine disparaged, and the ranks of the church have been filled with worldly men, and souls have been lost.

There is still another evil resulting from that strange error of thirty years ago, and it is not small, however we may consider it. This is a fearful floating dead weight of unacceptable and uncalled ministers. They may be very good men, but nobody wants to be there when they try to preach. Their life, consequently, is a failure ; and, since failure sours a man, and stirs up whatever uncomfortable tempers his mother may have given him, and he will be ever blaming others, rather than his own incompetency, and will envy and decry those who succeed, these preachers who can not preach become eminent for one thing, and that is, as troublers of the churches with their pastors and deacons, giving rise to the slanderous assertion that no other man is so much to be dreaded in the parish as a retired minister, whereas it is true only of the ministers who are not preachers, and so have had very small things to retire from.

Christ exercised his sovereignty, doubtless, when he elected those twelve plain men to be his apostles. But does any one doubt that they had natural gifts which had to do with their success as preachers, and gifts which God has not bestowed on every man ? Therein Christ exercised an intelligent judgment, and the churches and schools of the prophets must do the same.

The men are in the churches, created and specially endowed by God for the work of the ministry. They are in our schools and colleges; in the banking and mercantile establishments of the cities; in the printing office; on the farm and in the blacksmith's shop, in remote, out of the way sections of the country; or leading the rough life of a sailor, on far distant stormy seas.

What is the other thing required? Plainly, that these men have an opportunity to grow into faithful pastors and able preachers of the word. Has there been no mistake among us, as to what the preacher is, and how he is produced? We have thought to construct him; he is a development: we would build him, like a house, with square and compass, and axes and hammers; he is a growth, like a tree, from a creation and a new creation of God. You can make a house, but you can not make a preacher any more than you can make a tree. God makes him, and next to God he makes himself.

We believe in the theological seminary; but it is not a divine institution, neither is it indispensable. The world has never seen a nobler race of preachers than the Puritans in the days of Elizabeth. Their theological seminary was in those district meetings which were held for the training of the young preachers in the knowledge of the Bible, promptness and accuracy of thought, and fluent extemporaneous utterance. New England did well also in the days when her theological seminaries were the studies and parishes and pulpits of her active pastors.

All this is not to decry our own venerated schools of the prophets. We affirm, on the contrary, that they ought to give us the best race of preachers the world ever saw. Unless they shall be found to do, in some good measure, this great work, the churches may choose to dispense with them, and therein may do wisely.

It must be kept in mind, by those to whom is committed the direction of our theological seminaries, that all their processes should have a direct reference to the pulpit. They are expected to send out PREACHERS. Scholars, theologians, elegant writers, let them be if possible; it is a thing to be desired, doubtless, that the Christian ministry should be, as, to a large extent, it always has been in New England, a priesthood of

learning. But *preachers* they *must be*. The pulpit is the tower of their strength. Scholars, theologians, elegant writers, and much more in the same direction, they may be ; prepared to excel as editors, professors, secretaries, yet fail in the pulpit, where God made them to be preëminent. Nay, your Greek and Hebrew and theology and canons of logic and canons of rhetoric, and making of sermons, invaluable to the preacher, as they undoubtedly are, may, standing alone, even bury so deep the fountain of eloquence, that it will never come to the surface. We have called the preacher's peculiar and marvelous faculty divine. So is a tree ; but a tree must unfold and develop into strength and symmetry and beauty, in favoring circumstances. The theological seminary must be a nursery where the preacher grows toward the fulness of his power.

It should never be forgotten for a day, from the time a man enters the seminary to the end of the course, that his vocation is to be public speaking : that it is a grand vocation, demanding the exercise of a wonderful, God-given power, for which the multitude are always thirsting, and from which they will never turn away. It should never be forgotten that this wonderful power, innate, God-given, is susceptible of indefinite development ; and that, wherever, in any age or among any people, it has been exhibited in the highest degree, it would not be easy to say whether more was due to nature or to art, to original endowment or lengthened and severe training. A slender, pale young man takes his place by the forge and anvil, and a few years later, we find there a man with broad, full chest, and muscular arm. But who believes that the slender *voice* can become, under proper training, full and deep and sonorous, like the sound of a trumpet ? This, too, is a matter very much of muscular exercise and development ; and the training which secures all the finest qualities of the human voice, will, at the same time, expand the chest, and impart color to the cheek and fire to the eye.

The crowning acquisition of the preacher is the power to clothe his thoughts in words, and let them flow forth upon an audience, on a torrent or in an atmosphere of earnest and fervid feeling. This is a gift so rich, we are sorry to be compelled to say, so rare, that the man who shuts himself up in caves, or

walks day and night by the roaring sea, or travels through distant lands to attain it, shall confess himself a thousand times repaid for all his toils. What needs most to be insisted on to-day, and here in New England, is, that this gift may be acquired by every man who ought to think of entering the pulpit as his vocation; not by every man in an equal degree, but by every man in such degree that an intelligent audience will find it a pleasure to listen to him. Because a man has now and then flamed up into an orator, not only without any special training in that direction, but in spite of many unfavorable influences, the conclusion has been extensively accepted that eloquence is altogether a predestinate thing: that if nature designed a man for an orator he will be an orator, without any help from his school-masters; and that, on the other hand, if he does not show himself eloquent by nature, all the aid of school-masters will be in vain. A more palpable absurdity could not be entertained. It is most true, indeed, that if a man is not eloquent by nature, no amount of training will make him so. But it is equally true, that a man who is eloquent by nature, will never become eloquent in fact, without an amount of training somewhere which demands almost incredible toil. The best possible proofs and illustrations of this are the very men to whom the world is forever pointing as natural orators. Demosthenes, without his training, would have been excluded from cultivated Athenian circles, because of the clumsiness of his speech. Cicero traveled far, and submitted himself to many instructors, and triumphed over personal defects apparently insurmountable, before he electrified the senate and people of Rome, and sent his name sounding down through the ages as the synonym of eloquence. Henry Clay attained his matchless fluency and musical cadence, by the frequent and painful training of himself in private. Robert Hall broke down utterly in the pulpit, and more than once, in his earlier attempts to preach to a Bristol audience. Great orators have their 'secrets of the cave, which they do not like to disclose. But if there is any one thing which the history of true eloquence demonstrates, it is, that in no department of human attainment is excellence more largely the result of continuous and well-directed training, and no where else is less to be ex-

pected without such training, however great may be the measure of natural endowment. We say, therefore, that in a seminary which proposes, as its one object, to send forth preachers, all its methods should have reference to the pulpit.

Especially should such a seminary foster and encourage and cultivate incessantly by all the means in its power, a fluent and earnest utterance, as that without true eloquence can not be. That which we wish to affirm here, with special emphasis, is, that, through the entire preparatory course, fluency is to be preferred to correctness: and that, not only because all the world prefers warmth and fluency to accuracy in an orator, but because, by a law of nature, the attainment of fluency belongs to an earlier, and of correctness to a later period. If correctness be put first, as the manner of the schools long has been, in accordance with the canons of the doctors, there is no little danger lest, by the constant plying of the young men with rules and principles and unmerciful criticisms, as to style and method and language, you utterly crush out and kill all true freedom and earnestness, without which you can no more have real eloquence than you can have the sparkling, leaping, foaming river in a leaden pipe.

Lord Henry Brougham, himself a prince among orators, and a philosopher too, in writing to the father of Macaulay in relation to the education of his son, insists, with special earnestness, that the power of easy, fluent utterance should be acquired first of all. "Let him first of all learn to speak easily and fluently," he says; "as well and as sensibly as he can, no doubt, but at any rate let him learn to speak." He gives two reasons for the advice: one, that this is the true foundation on which to build, if a man is to be a public speaker, and the other, that it can only be acquired early in life.

For mental discipline, biblical learning, theology, and the writing of sermons, the regular course of training for the Christian ministry in our American colleges and seminaries has distanced all competition. For securing preachers, it has exhibited no special adaptation; which is not to say that we have not had in New England a succession of men of great pulpit power, who have used all these advantages with consummate skill. To march and counter-march a man, in morning and

evening drill, for a fixed term of years, through the prescribed courses of stately seminaries, and then, at a time appointed, when he has been duly laden with Greek and Hebrew, and canons of logic and canons of rhetoric, and dogmas philosophic and dogmas theological, and church history and polite literature, solemnly to license him to preach! the very thing which of all others he feels he can not do, and for the doing of which you have given him no proper training; if the thing were not an institution, would it not be a cruel satire? It is proposed to teach a man to swim. There is placed before him a painted water, and the wall is covered with diagrams; then he is plied with a lengthened course of instructions, how to carry his head, his chest; how to move his arms, his legs; how to turn the palms of his hands, how to lie on his back, and how to float with the stream. He is permitted to go through some of the proper motions, and all his mistakes are severely criticised. All this for two years. Then, on a set day, he is brought to a real water, where the channel is deep and the current strong, and with a multitude on the shore, who are to watch every movement and laugh at him if he fails, he is solemnly licensed to swim, and bid plunge in. What will he do? Why, when he feels the cold water, which he did not feel in the painted river, and struggles with the dashing wave, and remembers that the water is deep, and that many are looking at him from the shore, expecting to see the grand results of his long and expensive training, he will pant; and then throw up his arms; and then—sink! So many a minister has done, when, if he had been trained according to the principles of common sense, his life might have been, not a failure, but a brilliant success.

Can it be necessary to say, that, having direct reference to pulpit power in the best and highest sense, the Bible should be the grand classic and magazine and handbook of the entire course? It should be read and pondered, day and night, until its histories and facts and doctrines and precepts become as familiar as household words. To discourse of these things in the pulpit is the one life-long vocation of the preacher. They are themes high as the throne of God, vast as eternity. They will wake up the intellect, and move the heart to deep feeling and the tongue to eloquence, as no other themes can. Senti-

ment, poetry, flowers of rhetoric, questions of philosophy, splendors of diction, are trifling and impertinence in comparison. The thorough mastery of Paul's single epistle to the Romans will work out a better theology for the pulpit than the study of all the systems of divinity ever written.

Passing by all which might be said of the value of a familiar acquaintance with the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures in relation to this point, we do but repeat the language of secular men, when we say, that there can not be found in all the wide range of English literature any thing which can be brought in comparison with the Bible for the student in eloquence. For simplicity, force, elegance, pathos, power, our English Bible stands alone and preëminent, and contains in a single volume all the richest treasures of eloquence, and much more than all which can be culled in a thousand years from all the poetry and history and oratory which have been preserved to us from the days of Chaucer to the present time. A constant and diligent study of the Bible will give to the preacher a better style for the pulpit, and for effective oratory, than the most familiar acquaintance with all the best uninspired models of ancient and modern times. Daniel Webster owed more to the Bible in this respect than to Quintilian and Cicero and Demosthenes and Edmund Burke.

There is one other qualification for effective pulpit eloquence in comparison with which all that has been named sinks into insignificance. It is earnest piety. There is a power in the pulpit which consists in voice, manner, originality of thought, strength of argument, splendor of diction, brilliancy of genius: but it is not the highest. George Whitefield was an immeasurably greater power in the kingdom of God than Massillon, and Charles Haddon Spurgeon is greater than Bourdaloue, though in natural endowments immeasurably inferior. That is one point. There is another which deserves attention in our day, and it is, that a profound and earnest piety tends directly to the highest development and strength of all a man's natural powers. To aim at intellectual excellence, as the main thing, therefore, is to miss the mark every way. When Paul has fought with beasts at Ephesus, and gained the victory, animated and sustained by the sublime hope of the resurrection;

when Luther and Bunyan have contended with foes temporal and spiritual, more terrible than the raging waves of the sea, and have conquered by faith and prayer, then it has been given to these men to see visions of God which have made all earthly things fade away into the faintest shadow of a shade; and eternity and judgment and heaven and hell have been to them realities, stupendous and awful, and they have preached with an irresistible power to the heart and conscience of dying men.

Few men can have the experiences of Paul and Martin Luther and John Bunyan: but all men can pray, and obtain wondrous answers to their prayer. What Luther wrought out in storms and revolutions which sent dismay to the hearts of tyrants, and gave a reformed Christianity to Europe and the world, our young men aspiring to the high vocation of the preacher may demonstrate, first within the quiet precincts of the theological seminary, and afterward amid the most peaceful scenes of pastoral life. *Bene orasse est bene studisse.* Then, whatever other attributes of the preacher they may possess, this will secure to them a new and wondrous force and energy; and it shall be even as if one were risen from the dead, or angels clothed with the power of God had come down to men.

It must not be forgotten that, as this is immeasurably the most important of all the qualifications of the preacher, so, by a great law of analogy, it is immeasurably the most difficult. Coleridge has said, that to swing on hooks thrust through the body, or to walk with shoes having nails driven through the soles and pointing upward, is easier than to reflect. But to have all the natural powers cultivated and improved in the utmost possible degree, and then to account all these as nothing in comparison with deep and earnest personal piety, this is infinitely a more difficult thing. Build, with vast expense and mighty toil, a splendid mansion; decorate the ceiling, fresco the walls, hang it all full of richest tapestries and costly pictures; and then with your own hand set fire to it, and stand and gaze, with folded arms, and without emotion, till only ashes are left. This, too, would be easier far than the thing for which we plead. And yet that thing is possible by the Spirit of God.

The distinguishing characteristic and crowning excellence of our modern schools of the prophets then, should be found in

their constant endeavor, above all things, to cultivate in the young preachers the spirit of an earnest, manly piety; accounting that without this the highest intellectual power, with all possible human culture, can only result in mournful failure as regards the great end for which Christ has instituted the ministry of the word.

If Christianity is destined to assert any new power over the nations, and to give to society a higher enfranchisement than has been realized hitherto, it can only be, as we judge, through a signal revival of the power of the pulpit. Nay, is not this indispensable, in our own country at least, to arrest the progress of social evils of which we are more afraid every day, and to save us from a frightful moral degeneracy?

This is the question of the churches. Let them look to it. If they discern the signs of the times, and have formed already a deliberate and fixed judgment as to the order of preachers which the pressing exigencies of the times demand, let them see to it that the demand is met. The field is white already. If our nation is to be saved from perils greater than all we seem to have escaped hitherto, if we are to have, in the generations to come, a Christian Sabbath and a family compact, a free government and a loyal people, then, doubtless, the pulpit, out of weakness made strong, must assert and maintain its supremacy, must take to itself all its proper attributes, and wield with a skill and effect which even wicked men will be constrained to admire, the sword of the Spirit, making its irresistible appeal to the understanding, the conscience, the heart. Then the reason will be compelled to bow to inspiration, and philosophy will stand abashed before the cross. The primitive spirit of Christian fellowship will be restored. The temples built for God, whether simple and inexpensive, or costly and beautiful, will scarcely be remembered by the spiritual worshippers, bringing their hearts' oblation to Him whom the heaven of heavens can not contain. Then God will be seen to be greater than man; eternity greater than time; and the salvation of a single soul of infinitely more value than all the immunities of liberty and civilization and material prosperity secured to the entire human race for ten thousand years.

All this, and much more, that simplest of agencies, the Chris-

tian pulpit, is divinely adapted and ordained to accomplish. It will draw the multitudes everywhere to hear the Gospel, even as they followed Christ into the wilderness. It will make the wicked tremble, and fill the saints of God with joy. It will give to the oppressed of every land the only true enfranchisement. It will set the crown on the head of Jesus Christ.

ARTICLE II.

JEWISH BAPTISM IN THE TIMES OF OUR LORD, AS RELATED TO HOUSEHOLD BAPTISM.

“Teach all nations”: make disciples, proselytes of them, to my religion [*μαθητεῖσατε*]. “Baptizing them.” What is that? The term is not explained. It has no qualifying words as to mode or subjects. Without comment or enlargement, do the Apostles know what the ascending Master means? Shut out all history between now and then, go back beyond the Book of Acts and the day of pentecost, hear for yourself that command, and what will you do? “Baptizing them.” What is the thing to be done? To whom is it to be done? Is there any antecedent or surrounding light to guide you? You can not consult the Book of Acts and the Epistles, the Councils, the Fathers, and Christian history. Is there any sacred service or ceremony of the times that can explain the command? Evidently our Lord assumes that the Apostles know what he means, without an explanation. And they do know. You, set back so far, and under that command, would at once recur to John’s baptism for explanation and guidance. That would be your principal if not only aid, and it would be enough.

Back then in Judaea, in the year thirty-three of our Lord, and under this commission for baptizing, what are you going to do? You would make a careful study and digest of John’s baptism, and follow it strictly as your interpreter, except where divinely authorized to vary from it.

Our teacher and example, when we have thus gone back, is one whose raiment is camel's hair, whose girdle is leathern, whose spirit and power are as of a prophet. As when we by sudden discovery bring forth a painting from the dust and cob-webs of a convent cell, the gem of an old master, glorious in the costume and colors of an elder and better day, so he stands among the wondering multitude as one of the old prophets risen from the dead. "All the people are in expectation, and all men muse in their hearts whether he be the Christ or not." The times are full of this expectation of the Messiah. Men are studying promise and prophecy, and they watch and wait. When, therefore, the prophecy of Isaiah is answered in "the voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the Lord," the multitude flock about the mysterious preacher as the harbinger of the Christ. And when he preached to the people repentance, and urged a cordial preparation for the coming Lord, and an acceptance of him, they were eager to seal these promises of reform and undergo a ceremonial purification, as about to be subjects in "the kingdom of heaven," now at hand under a new dispensation. So there "went out to him Jerusalem and all Judaea, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Mt. iii. 5, 6. So general was that expectation of the Messiah, and so ready were they to prepare the way of the Lord, that this baptism was almost as the baptism of the populace, so extensive was it.

The import of the rite is obvious. It was performed on a circumcised people, the chosen of God. They had broad notions of discrimination between the clean and the unclean. When Aaron and his sons were consecrated for the priesthood they were washed and made clean, and when Israel was about to receive the dispensation of Moses and of Sinai they were required first to wash and be clean. Baptism has the import of purification and dedication, and so now, when "Jerusalem and all Judaea" are about to receive the Christian dispensation, this rite is administered to them as purifying and preparatory and dedicatory. Indeed we find that this High Priest himself is inaugurated by the same rite of consecration. So it became him to fulfil all righteousness; and so "when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also was baptized."

This, then, was not Christian baptism. That was first administered a few years afterward to those three thousand Christian converts on the day of pentecost. It was not a baptism representative of "the washing of regeneration." For some of the subjects of it thirty years afterwards had "not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Acts xix. 2. And then the Master himself received it, in whom it could represent no such regenerating work.

It was administered to church members. It was a ceremonial purification and introduction of the church to a higher and holier dispensation. The baptism of John was a formal purification of the people, preparatory to the inauguration of Christianity. He "called upon his countrymen to prepare themselves, by repentance for sin and reception of baptism as a symbol of a changed mood, to enter into the Messianic kingdom, now on the point of being established."¹

The baptism, as an act, does not seem to have created any interest, as if it were a strange custom in Judea, introduced by John himself. Indeed in all the hostility to John and his work there is no accusation that he had assumed to create another and novel sacred service; and in all the hostility of the Jews to the Christians in their innovations in religious teachings and ceremonies, it is nowhere implied that the Jews regarded baptism as a new rite, springing up with this new sect.

On the question of household baptism some are troubled to find any recognition of it in New Testament times. So it is hopefully inferred that the baptism of children is only a human invention, that came into the church among other innovations in the second Christian century. For it is agreed that in the middle of the third, at the council of sixty six bishops at Carthage, A. D., 253, the rite was so well established as to give rise to a lengthy discussion whether an infant could properly be baptized before the eighth day, thus assuming, as both duty and usage, that it ought to be baptized sometime.

The baptism of John, preceding Christian times, is also conceded, but when the question is put: "The baptism of John, who received it?" like those first troubled by the question, "Whence

¹Guericke's Ch. His., Shedd's Ed. p. 36. See also Mosheim's Commentaries, Murdoch's, Ed. 1: 89.

was it?" they answer: "We can not tell." Yet they add: It did not include infants. They know a negative, a denial, only.

A tolerably fair ecclesiastical history covering the period between the return from the captivity and the apostolic pentecost remains to be written, and when written will close the controversy on the disputed rite. A single link only remains to complete the chain of historical argument. That link is furnished by showing the object of John's baptism, and the subjects of it: whom he baptized, and for what purpose he did it. Without any good reason this field of inquiry has been abandoned, and so the question of infant baptism has been lost in many minds simply by default. Some practice it without knowing why, some because it will do no harm, and very many in our church neglect it wholly. So doing, the constitution of the church of God is very greatly misunderstood and mutilated.

We enter, therefore, in this paper, into a historical inquiry as to the use that the Jews made of baptism before and during and immediately after the times of John the Baptist.

When baptism was introduced among the Jews is not definitely settled; it is of very ancient if not unknown antiquity. The Septuagint says that Naaman, the Syrian, was baptized in Jordan for the curing of his leprosy: ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ. 2 Kings v. 14, and that unrighteousness baptized Isaiah: ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει. Isa. xxi. 4. If Alexandrian Greek, in the year B. C. 285, could properly describe acts as baptisms that took place among the Jews seven hundred and nine hundred years before the Christian era, we can easily presume that baptism was a rite of very great antiquity among them.¹

One thing is evident. In the times of our Lord the rite was national and common among the Jews. So Jost² says: "Jesus also, knowing the national custom, received consecration from him." Jost's Gen. His. of the Israelites. Vol. 2. B. 8, c. 6.

"The first use of baptism was not exhibited at that time" of John the Baptist, says Lightfoot, "For baptism very many centuries of years backwards had been both known and re-

¹ We find twenty and more cases of the use of *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω*, and their related words, in the Septuagint.

² Jost "a learned Jewish Rabbi, who has devoted his life to the investigation of such subjects, and who is considered by intelligent Jews as the most profound historian of the age." Rev. James Murdock, D. D., Bib. Repos. 14: 174.

ceived in most frequent use among the Jews, and for the very same end as it now obtains among Christians, namely, that by it proselytes might be admitted into the church; and hence it was called baptism for proselytism." And he refers to the Babylonian Talmud for his authority. Lightfoot's Works, London, 1684. Vol. 2: 117.

He also adds that it was an axiom among the Jews: "No man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and baptized." And so he says: "You see baptism inseparably joined to the circumcision of proselytes." Works, Vol. 2: p. 118.

So Maimonides, one of the very best ancient Jewish historians, whom they call "The glory of the East," "The light of the West," says: "In all ages when an ethnic is willing to enter into the covenant, and gather himself under the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice, or if it be a woman, be baptized and bring a sacrifice." Wall's His. Infant Bap., Cotton's Ed., Ox., 1844. Vol. 1: 5. By this last remark of Maimonides it will be noticed that female converts to Judaism received the ordinance of baptism. The authorities are full on this point.

The Talmud says: "We find concerning the maidservants, who were baptized, but not circumcised," that they are proselytes. "One baptizeth a heathen woman in the name of a woman; we can assert that for a deed rightly done." Lightfoot, 2: 117-18.

Yet again: "When a proselyte is received, he must be circumcised, and then they baptize him in the presence of two wise men, saying: Behold, he is an Israelite in all things: or if it be a woman, the women lead her to the waters," etc. Wall's His. Inf. Bap. 1: 7.

But what should be more carefully noted as bearing peculiarly on our inquiry into the import and scope of John's baptism, if the parents were baptized the young children were included as a matter of course. The law of baptism held all who were held by the law of circumcision, and went beyond, including females. From the abundance of testimony to this point we give an item or two.

Says Lightfoot: "For so was the custom of the Jewish na-

tion in their use of baptism, when a proselyte came in, his children were baptized with him: and all this upon this ground, that all that were related to the parent might come into covenant." Works, Vol. 2 : 1128.

And to the same effect he quotes the Babylonian Talmud and Commentary thus: "They baptize a little proselyte according to the judgment of the Sanhedrin. If he be deprived of his father, and his mother bring him to be made a proselyte, they baptize him, because none becomes a proselyte without circumcision and baptism, according to the judgment of the Sanhedrin, that is, that three men be present at the baptism, who are now instead of a father to him." Do. 118.

As to the age under which a child may be the proper subject of infant baptism, they had this rule :

" Any male child of a proselyte, that was under the age of thirteen years and a day, and females that were under twelve years and a day, they baptized as infants, at the request and by the assent of the father, or the authority of the court, because such an one was not yet the son of assent, as they phrase it, i. e., not capable to give assent for himself. But the thing is for his good. If they were above that age they consented for themselves." Wall. 1 : 17.

This usage of infant baptism among the Jews is farther illustrated by one of those mercies that cropped out over the barbaric roughnesses of their time. The practice of the heathen to expose their infants to death is well known, and such were often found by the Jews and adopted into their families either as children or servants. They did the same often with infants that came into their hands by victory on the battle field. For the treatment of these, the Jerusalem Talmud thus prescribes :

"Behold one finds an infant cast out, and baptizes him in the name of a servant. Do thou also circumcise him in the name of a servant. But if he baptize him in the name of a freeman, do thou also circumcise him in the name of a freeman." Wall. 1 : 20.

The statement of Maimonides is also to the same purpose: "An Israelite that takes a little heathen child, or that finds an

heathen infant and baptizes him for a proselyte, behold he is a proselyte." Wall. 1: 20.

These are but a few of the very many specific and direct declarations of the practice of baptism by the Jews in the times of John the Baptist. It is not needful to multiply these quotations. But there are certain incidental, or wayside items, that have a peculiar force in illustrating this practice.

Maimonides says that when any offered themselves as proselytes for baptism, "they make diligent inquiry concerning such, lest they come to get themselves under the law for some riches that they should receive, or for dignity that they should obtain, or for fear. If it be a man, they inquire whether he have not set his affections on some Jewish woman, or a woman, her affection on some young man of Israel." Maimonides makes mention, also, of many minute circumstances that must attend the ceremony of baptism. It must not be on the Sabbath, nor on any holiday, nor by night. There must be three witnesses of the ceremony. Circumcision must precede it, and a bloody offering accompany it. Yet in times of revolution or dispersion the sacrifice may be omitted. The sacrifice must be a burnt offering of a beast, or of two turtle-doves, or of two young pigeons. It was also a rite never to be repeated on the same person. Nor were the children born to proselyte parents after their baptism to be baptized. For baptism by the Jew was regarded as a purification of the race, or family stock. The parents once purified, all their unborn posterity was made pure too.

Here is the fittest place to mark the sharp distinction that the Jew made between baptism and circumcision in their uses. Baptism constituted one a Jew, while circumcision constituted him a church member. Wall. 1: 5-45.

The side allusions to this usage, scattered through the best Jewish authorities, show baptism to have been as surely an ordinance among them, as circumcision or sacrifice.

Now we see well the reason for these strong and confident declarations of Dr. Lightfoot, a man so scholarly in the writings of the Jews concerning their doctrines and antiquities: "Baptism was well enough known to the Jews, and both John and Jesus Christ took it up as they found it." "Christ took up baptism as he found it in the Jewish church, and they baptized

infants as well as grown persons." "Think not that baptism was never used till John Baptist came and baptized. It was used in the church of the Jews many generations before he was born." "Baptism of men, women and children was no new thing among them when John Baptist came baptizing, but a thing as well known as with us now." "Christ took baptism into his hands, and into evangelical use, as he found it, this only added, that he might promote it to a worthier end, and to a larger use. The whole nation knew well enough that little children used to be baptized. Nor do I believe this people, that flocked to John's baptism, were so forgetful of the manner and custom of the nation, that they brought not their little children also with them to be baptized." "We suppose, therefore, that men, women and children came to John's baptism, according to the manner of the nation in the reception of proselytes." Lightfoot's Works, Vol. 2 : pp. 1129, 1133, 1040, 119, 122.

In these historic inquiries into the baptism of John we find several important facts.

Baptism as a religious ceremony was in common use among the Jews in the time of John the Baptist. Why introduced among the Jews, and how long before, and by what authority, are questions not pertinent to the unfolding of our one topic. It is enough here to know the fact that baptism was in general practice among the Jews before and during the time of John. It was used as an introductory rite to a new religion. The Jews esteemed the pagan gentiles an unclean people. Yet they were constantly drawing converts from them. When one came over to Judaism, he received the baptismal cleansing. The act made him a Jew. It initiated him into a new religion. It did not admit him to church membership. This was the office of circumcision. When the father of a family received it, the rite was also administered to his children of thirteen years and under. If an adult female became a proselyte, she also received baptism. So was the ordinance both national and common. When John the Baptist entered on his work as the forerunner of Christ, and as introducing a new religious dispensation, he found this proselyte baptism in common use. His work was to persuade the Jewish populace to receive a higher and holier religion, to proselyte them to another system. This

proselyte baptism was precisely the rite he needed to indicate the purification of his converts, and to seal them over to this new religion. This baptism John practiced during the years of his ministry, and so successful was he that it became a national proselytism. There "went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."

So much for the usage, facts and subjects of John's baptism. It may be objected that we have quoted mainly from Rabbies, and Talmuds, and Jewish authors and traditions, and that these are not to be trusted. We submit that all ecclesiastical and exegetical writers on the sacred authors and ceremonies of the first century, make free use of the authorities we have quoted, when there is nothing manifestly untrue in the quotation they would wish to make. We use Josephus in this way, trusting him when he is not self-contradictory, or contradicted by manifest fact. Rawlinson convicts Herodotus of very grave mistakes, but we rely on Herodotus nevertheless, in every point where we do not convict him. In the same way it is manifestly just to use Jewish witnesses. It is a huge assumption and an assault on the canons of historical criticism thus to reject this historical account of Jewish infant baptism in the times of our Lord, and without specific objections to the specific passages.

Look at it. Very early in the Christian centuries, as early as 200 A.D., the Jews, as all agree, baptized infants. With the Christians the custom was old and well established, all agree, as early as A. D. 233. When did the Jews adopt it? He rejecting these statements of its use in the times of John, is obligated to tell us. Did the Jews borrow the rite from the Christians? A Jew borrow a sacred rite from a Christian! The Jerusalem Talmud, one of the authorities we have quoted, was probably written before the year 200 A.D., and contains a vast amount of nonsense. Yet its simple, often puerile detail of rites and ceremonies and religious notions is to be as fully trusted as any other history not absurd, or opposed to known fact.

The paedobaptists have committed a grave error in yielding this historical evidence from Jewish writings so readily on an opposing assumption, a mere dictum. Their history of infant

baptism among themselves is the uninspired preface to the inspired history of household baptism in the Book of Acts. It is as reliable as any chapter in Grecian or Roman history, written a century or two after the events.

"Go teach all nations baptizing them." Was that a new word then, pointing to a new ceremony? If so how could "the eleven" understand it? It is not explained in their commission. If baptism was not then common, they might well say: "What is this new thing we are to do?"

In pursuing the inquiry, who, according to this last command of our ascending Lord, should be baptized, we need, not so much a lexicon to define the word, or a commentary to give the opinions of the learned, as a view of the times when the Lord Jesus issued the commission. For it is one of the first principles of interpretation, in gaining the import of an old law, to ascertain how it would fall in with the times when it was given, how it would suit the circumstances of that day, and how those to whom it was given would naturally understand it. The time and the place of the giving of a brief and doubtful command are two admirable expositors. They are as the "two great lights" that God made in the beginning.

Let us, then, place ourselves with "the eleven" when they were commissioned for this baptismal work. They are in *Judea*, and near the close of the first third of the first Christian century. Judaism is as yet the religion of the land. Its religious forms, rites and ceremonies are daily seen on every hand. The eleven are commanded to go and make disciples to Christ, or proselytes to the Gospel. This is the import of that word, "teach," and is so given in the marginal reading in the English version. The eleven understood this duty. They saw such religious labor in the daily life of the Jews around them. Those Jews were compassing sea and land to make proselytes, and the disciples understood that with a deeper ardor, and for a vastly holier purpose, they were to imitate them in proselytizing.

Then, when by their teaching they had gained a disciple, a proselyte to this new religion, they were to baptize him. This ordinance was no novelty to them. It was from the olden time in the holy land. As zealous Jews formerly themselves, they had labored to gain gentile converts, and bring them to this

purifying rite. And often had they seen it administered. The Lake of Merom and the Sea of Galilee, as well as waters more limited, had witnessed the dedication of many a proselyte. What multitudes had they seen thronging to John's baptism at Ænon, and along the Jordan, while probably they themselves received the same baptism. Then what they were commanded now to do was no new and strange thing. The mode and nature of the ceremony were familiar to them, as common usage in their native land. True, they were to exact a more spiritual and radical preparation for it, and were to attach a deeper significance to it, but the rite itself was to them an old and familiar rite.

They had seen adult females receive, as proselytes, this ordinance, and so become members of the commonwealth of Israel. They saw them in the mixed multitude that gathered so eagerly to John's baptism. So when they made disciples and baptized them, they would as a matter of course, include the females, though we do not find any specific order to this effect. As a matter of recorded fact, we find that they did thus infer their duty, and did baptize women.

The eleven also saw that proselyte parents, coming over to Judaism, brought their little ones with them to baptism, and made them over to the new religion with the same ceremonial seal of water. They knew no case where a proselyte parent had kept back his infant child from baptism. To the male infant of a gentile, thus coming over to Judaism, they knew that baptism was as much a matter of course as circumcision. Each was inevitable. "The whole nation knew well enough that little children used to be baptized." It was as persistently exacted as the other ceremonies so tenaciously held and rigidly enforced by that ritual people. It was an integral part of the idea of proselyte baptism, as held and practiced in those times, that it covers the child as well as the parent. This the eleven knew, and saw illustrated, and very like had practiced, as Jews.

This was the usage and the history of those times. These were the surroundings of the disciples, when commanded to baptize their converts. An ancient and common rite, that, coming on the head, invariably covered the members of the household, they were to administer. There is no qualifying

word, no intimation, that in the new use of an old rite, there is to be any change as to the sex or age of the subjects of it.

Place yourself, now, in those times, and in those circumstances, and, receiving that command, whom would you baptize? How would the sentiments and usages of the times concerning the rite of proselyte baptism, interpret the command to you? The Jews around you, your neighbors, are industrious in making proselytes; and gaining the head of a gentile family, they baptize the household. You are commanded to make proselytes and baptize. You have no command or intimation to draw a dividing line between the parent and the infant child in administering the ordinance. The command is simply to baptize, as if from all you know of usage, and all you see in practice about you, there could be no need of describing more specifically who should be baptized. You are left, therefore, for an interpretation of the command to the practice of your proselyting neighbors, the Jews. They followed the rule as the Talmud records it. "Any male child of a proselyte, that was under the age of thirteen years and a day, and females that were under twelve years and a day," should be baptized. In those circumstances could the eleven do anything otherwise than baptize believers and their households? What was there to suggest to them in those times any other course? What was there to give to them the notion, so foreign to all the teaching and practice of the day, and of the Jewish church from Abraham, that the infant of the believer was to be passed by?

And here it should be said that we are not to mark out a course, or provide an interpretation for the eleven, from the views and feelings of this day. We may not make up a creed and course of conduct out of our present denominational material, and carry it back to them for acceptance and use.

Out of the material for a judgment of duty that they then had, in the traditions, teachings and practices of their times, what line of obedience would they naturally, and as a matter of course, mark out for themselves? As this command of our Lord is a brief and unexplained command, the import of it must be made up from the views and uses of baptism that prevailed when the command was given. As a matter of course,

therefore, the eleven would proceed, even as Jews, to baptize the children of proselyte believers.

It is now in place to notice certain common and plausible objections. So long as these very important facts, now stated, are unknown or unadmitted, there are some objections to infant baptism that must lie with much weight. If the Jewish usages of baptism be kept out of the argument, and the history of Jewish religious ceremonies in the times of John the Baptist be excluded, then objections to paedobaptism may have a peculiar force. But it is a force that they only seem to have, while material facts are absent.

1. It is objected that the command is to baptize only believers. And so it may be correctly said that only believers in Judaism were to receive the circumcision and baptism of a proselyte. Yet when that proselyte had children, even so young as to be unable to believe, they were to receive these rites. The rite among the Jews in baptizing proselytes was to baptize only believers. An adult believer must be found, according to the command of our Lord, before baptism could be administered, but when found, his infant children were to be reckoned as natural adjuncts of the man. They were regarded, ecclesiastically, as parts of his personal responsibility, and so were not to be dissevered from him in any total dedication of himself and all his to God. The ancient policy of God was to build up his church by family additions, and ever regarding, as he did, the family as a unit, he embraced all when he specified the head. So when the parent believed, the children were held to be believers also by presumption and anticipation. The policy of God was not like that of too many parents, who presume on the child's being an unbeliever, and expect it, and so treat it negligently and hopelessly, and thus make out a parental insurance and foreordination of unbelief. Unlike this unnatural process, having the seeds of death in it as an organic law, was the encircling bond of mercy and of gracious expectation in which our Heavenly Father enclosed his accepted ones. How often in his covenants of mercy do we find the phrases, "children's children," "a seed to serve him," "a generation." On this principle his church was built at the first, having not an individual but a family basis, and this policy was

actively in practice in the times of our Saviour. He continues it in the command to baptize only believers. As a matter of theory in the church from time immemorial, and as a theory in full practice in the church to which they were to make proselyte additions, the Apostles would, as a matter of course, gather in the little ones with the parents. To have done otherwise would have required, first, a radical reconstruction of the church, and then a specific order to exclude children.

When one objects to infant baptism by saying that baptism is a sign and seal of saving faith, and that saving faith should precede it, he is obligated to explain a difficulty that his sweeping objection creates. Circumcision is called "a seal of the righteousness of faith." Rom. iv. 11. Yet infants received this seal before they were old enough to have faith. On the same principle, whatever it be, they may receive baptism. By the same exegesis and principles infant baptism and infant circumcision stand or fall together. The objection to the former, that faith can not precede it, as a seal of faith, is valid against the latter. So the objection is an objection against fact. It is an objection to what actually took place, that infants, who were not old enough to exercise faith, received the seal of faith.

It is an objection against fact. Adult and believing parents "were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Their infant children were baptized at the same time without confessing their sins, just as they were circumcised without confession.

Moreover, if want of belief should prevent infant baptism, why should it not prevent infant salvation? For it is said: "He that believeth not shall be damned."

This rigid exegesis, demanding belief precedent to baptism, not only subverts the divine theory of circumcision, but makes the salvation of infants impossible. The exegesis is as unscriptural as the conclusion is abhorrent. We hope that in the sacred memories of coming ages we shall not become that traditional Calvinist, preaching, when long dead, what he was never known to have preached when he was alive, that there are infants in hell not a span long, because they were not old enough in this world to believe and be baptized.

2. It is objected that there is no command in the Bible to baptize infants. In the light of the facts now before us there

would be no need of such a command to the Apostles. The objection goes on the assumptions that the Apostles are about to organize the church of Christ as a new institution, and that the nature of church membership is now to be determined for the first time, and that the rite of initiation is a novel one for the times, and not interpreted and limited, in the extent of its application, by precedent and daily use. But the church of Christ is one from the days of Abraham and continues through all the ages. No new church is formed. David and Paul and the Christian converts on the day of pentecost are members of the same church, having the same creed. The ancient principle of membership embraced the children of the adult believer. Changing one characteristic in the seal of membership would not change this ancient principle, any more than changing the motto on a government seal would change the import and power of the seal. We have seen, too, that our Saviour took an existing and common rite, by which the Jews admitted proselytes to Judaism, and promoted it to be the introductory rite to the Christian church. When the Jews used this rite, initiating a gentile parent, they invariably applied it to his little ones. So far, then, this would be a happy ordinance to come in the place of circumcision, since it embraced the children of believers, as circumcision had done.

When, therefore, Christ commanded his Apostles to baptize, what need was there to command, in an especial manner, the baptism of children? Instead, therefore, of allowing this objection any force, it really turns on those moving it. Considering all the circumstances in the times of the Apostles, there should have been a special command to exclude children from baptism, if it was not designed to have them included. For if nothing were said, the presumption would be totally for their baptism. So the very silence of our Lord, that is made the ground of this objection, is virtually an affirmation of an existing command to embrace the children, and an approbation and adoption of an existing practice that did embrace them.

3. It is objected that baptism is a seal of personal righteousness, or true piety, and so an unconscious infant can not properly receive it. The objection misapprehends the nature of the ordinance. Baptism is more a rite of dedication than of con-

fession. The person or thing receiving the ordinance is thus sacredly set apart for God. As when one is baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, the name of the sacred Trinity is called and set upon him, as a mark of new ownership. It is also a purifying rite, ceremonially expressive of the fact that what is about to be given to God should be first purified. It is also a rite representative of that inward purification in which the Holy Spirit in regeneration dedicates the subject acceptably to God.

Now as baptism served as a rite of dedication, as well as for other purposes, it will at once be seen that an unconscious babe may be the subject of it. For a believing father or mother has the right to dedicate a child to God. All Christian parents agree in this. They differ only in the mode of doing it. One mode, and as we think, a mode appointed of God, is baptism. God asks the gift of the child, that it may be his and bear his name. And as a child is above all other wealth and worth, how fitting, when one makes a complete dedication of all he has to God, that the only immortal gift in the collection and total offering should be dedicated with a peculiar ceremony and seal.

4. It is objected that in infant baptism the child has no understanding of the rite, and gives no assent to it. This is true, even as it should be. In a proper, Christian state of society, where all heads of families are converted and professing Christians, baptism is an ordinance not to be understood or assented to by the subjects of it. Strictly and properly, baptism in the Christian church belongs only to an infant, as circumcision in the Jewish church. In the normal use of baptism it is a parental duty by which an immortal is dedicated to God. It classes among those duties that are to be done for another, and not by the person receiving the act. Adult baptism is a necessity created by a failure in parental duty. The parents of such an adult ought to have been godly, and to have given their child to God in this ordinance. Failing in this, the adult baptism is a necessity to cover a defect. It is irregular and abnormal. The case of circumcision sets this objection in its true light, and shows the true time and place for baptism. The only regular and proper subject of circumcision was an infant. It was no rite for him to understand, or assent to. It was a

parent's duty to God for the child; and had the whole family of man become the people of God before circumcision was abandoned, adult circumcision would have been impossible and unknown. In its original and legitimate design it did not belong to adults. Its application to them was an exception to the law. So the objection that infant baptism is without the understanding and assent of the person lies equally against circumcision. By covering too much ground it destroys itself. It is an objection to a principle that underlies circumcision and baptism, and a thousand other acts that we perform for a child, the principle that we may and often must act for the child without its assent. Baptism, when properly administered as to time, that is, in infancy, is simply and only the act of a parent, and it is no more necessary that the child comprehend and agree to it than that it comprehend and agree to the many duties that God requires us to discharge to our infant children. Adult baptism is a remedy for a defect, just as naturalization is, in constituting foreigners citizens under our government. Were there no more who could become immigrants, there could be no more naturalization. What it gains would be gained as a birthright, without knowledge or assent. And when infant baptism, even as circumcision, has its proper place among parental duties, as God originally designed, there will be no place for this irregular and remedial step of adult baptism. So the objection that the infant can not understand and give assent to its baptism is not only invalid in this specific case, but it is subversive of a fundamental principle in both the divine and the family government.

5. It is objected that infant baptism deprives one of the privilege of making a profession of religion for himself. This objection is founded on a false assumption. It is assumed that a profession of religion is made in the administration of the ordinance of baptism, and that a profession of religion can not be made unless this rite is administered at the time. Here is a confounding of two things that differ. Baptism is a rite of dedication. It is performed for a person. In the act the person is the passive recipient. He is the subject. But in making a profession of religion he is the agent, the actor. The profession is made through a creed, confession and covenant. One may be the

voluntary or the involuntary subject of a dedication to God, but a profession of religion is a cordial consent to such a dedication. It is the personal declaration of one's religious faith, feelings and purposes. In baptism one is given to God. He may be conscious of being given, as an adult, or unconscious, as an infant. If the former, he is not a professor by receiving the ordinance unless he has made a declaration of his religious doctrines, experiences and purposes. Our Baptist brethren agree to this. If an unconscious infant, it remains for the child to ratify the dedication in coming years, and give in his adhesion to Christ and his Gospel. When he does that, he makes a profession of religion. He is already dedicated, and bears the seal of the act.

The objection, moreover, lies on the strange assumption that all who come into the church, on a profession of faith, having received only infant baptism, are not professors of religion by any personal act of their own. The bare statement of such an assumption refutes the objection. All nominally in the Christian church, having received none but infant baptism, are reckoned and held as professors of religion in fact and form, because they made a public profession. By the one voice of common consent they are called professors. Yet they were not constituted such by infant baptism. Though baptized in infancy, if they had made no personal confession of Christ when they came to years of discretion, they would not be regarded as professors of religion. They became such by a personal and a subsequent act. There are many ten thousands in our congregations who were baptized in infancy, and yet no one calls them professors of religion. They have been solemnly given to God by their believing parents. They have received the appointed rite of dedication. They properly belong to God and are in the generation of his people. But they have not confessed into the faith of Abraham. They have not publicly received Christ as a personal Saviour, and his teaching as their rule of life. When they do this they will make a profession of religion. The public and common voice of all denominations will say that in that personal confession of Christ they made a profession of religion. Now all this common and public judgment shows two things. First, that infant baptism is not regarded as a

profession of religion, and secondly, that it does not stand in the way of making a profession, when an adult inclines so to do. So the parental duty of infant dedication does in no way interfere with the personal duty and privilege, in conscious and adult years, of professing Christ.

We obtain in this discussion on John's baptism the additional light needed fully to understand the cases of household baptism mentioned in the New Testament. Already they are clear almost to an absolute certainty. But some doubt, reading only the New Testament.

Let us come down into Christian history to the Council of Carthage, A.D., 253. Here we find the rite of infant baptism established beyond a question. It only remains for those sixty six bishops to answer the question of Fidus, whether an infant may be baptized before it is eight days old. The usage is conceded without a word, and within one hundred and fifty years of a living Apostle, and the closing of the New Testament canon. Cyprian's letter to Fidus in answer to his question reduces the number of doubters very much. Yet some doubt still.

Let us now go on the other side, the far side of the New Testament, to the times of John the Baptist. Here we find him baptizing households, believers and their children. "For so was the custom of the Jewish nation in their use of baptism, when a proselyte came in, his children were baptized with him." And when our Lord commissioned his Apostles to baptize he left them to learn what was meant, by leaving them to the teaching and influence of this custom. They, going about their work, baptized households, as that of the jailer, and Lydia and Stephanus. Can any one longer doubt what household baptism means in the New Testament? Infant baptism common in the year 30, A.D., and common in the year 253, A.D., and in doubt what household baptism means in the times between! Infant baptism common in the year 30, A.D., and doubtful whether it was allowable and possible and probable in the year 53, A.D., when the households of Lydia and the jailer and Stephanus were baptized! Between John the Baptist and these sixty six bishops, both which parties baptized infants, we have a range of two hundred and twenty three years not covered absolutely by historical evidence. The opposers of this rite, to

make their position good, must show that the Apostles did not follow the example before them, when Christ, without explaining, commanded them to baptize; and then show how the rite could have crept into the church and become established beyond a question or opposition, within one hundred and fifty years of the times of the Apostles. Surely it would be easier to lean tenderly toward the children, as our Lord did, when they were rudely excluded, and give them the benefit of any remaining doubts, by giving them as good a status in the Christian dispensation as they had in the Jewish.

:

ARTICLE III.

THE CYCLES OF HISTORY.

WE have sometimes imagined the wonder which Adam would have felt could he have seen fully mapped out before him the history of his posterity for these six thousand years. Such a multitude of tribes and nations; such diversities of character, language, forms of government, arts, manners and religion; such collisions and conflicts; such breaking in pieces of old systems, and springing into life and vigor of new ones, would have filled him with astonishment and perplexity.

At first sight, and without the clue which Christianity gives, the history of the world looks like a chaos. Empires arise, strong, well-compacted, splendid; they fill the world for a time with their renown; and then they are crushed by more powerful rivals, or are dissolved by their own weakness. Conquest succeeds conquest, and change follows change, as the waves roll one after the other, and break and are lost upon the beach.

But is there no divine law to be discovered in these changes? Has there been no true progress in the vast and varied movements which history records? Are we no nearer a goal than at the outset, or has mankind been going round and round the same weary road, like the horse grinding in the mill? And

must we believe that the world is doomed to a never-ending succession of cycles like those she has gone through, new formations of society on the ruins of the old, new growths out of the soil of a perished vegetation? Are we, for instance, to build up a new American civilization, radically different from that which was transplanted here by our fathers from the old world, itself to be superseded in its turn by something newer in the revolutions of the ages?

This we know, that no nation, no age, has been the mere repetition of another. Each has had something peculiar to itself. And it is not boastful to say that the civilization of the last three centuries is in some respects higher than had been known before, and this as the fruit of the labors of the preceding ages. We must believe that a divine purpose has been accomplished in all the changes through which man has passed. They have not been like the eternal roll of the ocean, issuing in nothing, reaching no haven, repeating from age to age its monotonous motion and roar; but rather like the course of the stream, which, though it may wind hither and thither, and sometimes may seem to flow back upon itself, and though its waters may partly stagnate in the swamp, or be swallowed up in the sands of the desert, yet has a living current still, which rests not till it finds its way to the ocean. And our object in the present Article is to show that the past ages of the world's history have not followed each other in blind succession, but have been linked together in a divine order, and that there has been a real progress towards the great end for which all things were made, the bringing in of the kingdom of God. We shall seek, especially, to prove that the great historical nations before the Christian era did not exist in vain, and that it was truly in "the fulness of times," in that ripe time for which all preceding ages and events had been the necessary preparation, that Christ was born into the world. There is a process of education for the race as truly as for the individual, and in obedience to the same great laws. There is an order which God observes in the training of mankind answering to that which regulates the development of infancy into manhood.

The spiritual powers and faculties of man may be divided for our present purpose into the moral and the intellectual, and the

latter class again into the imagination (with which we associate the reason in its highest natural form as the organ of intuitive truth) and the understanding. The moral powers imply conscience, or the faculty which discerns between right and wrong; and faith, which lays hold of truths that belong to the invisible and supernatural realm. In a well ordered system of education, these are the first to be awakened and cultivated. It is found that if the moral training of a child be neglected, it is almost impossible to supply the defect in after years. We must begin early to awaken the conscience, and to enlighten it that it may distinguish the good from the evil, the false from the true. We must from the start seek to develop those ideas of God and immortality, of freedom and responsibility, without which man were no better than the brutes, and which lie wrapped up in our spiritual constitution as our very birth-right. Moral culture should always precede intellectual. The foundation for the noblest character is laid in the quick discernment of moral distinctions, the strong feeling of obligation, the spirit of obedience, the purity which shrinks from a stain, and the early reception of those great spiritual mysteries which the heart of a child can lay hold of in faith, though no created intellect can fully comprehend them. Every wise system of education recognizes this principle and is constructed upon it; in every well ordered family it is put into practice. The Christian mother teaches her child to have faith in a being whom it can not hear, nor see, nor understand, and calls out its feelings of love and adoration towards him, long before she would task its faculties with a problem in arithmetic, or try to make it relish the beauties of a poem.

Next after the conscience, the imagination and the reasoning powers are developed. The one is the mind's faculty of picture-making, which shows itself very early in childhood in the transforming and coloring of the objects around it; as when the girl sees a queen beautiful as Cleopatra in her misshapen doll, and the boy a palace in his cobhouse, and a war horse in the stick which he bestrides. The imagination does not rest satisfied with the every-day world, nor much trouble itself about the literal truth of things. It uses these as suggestive of something higher and more wonderful. The mountain path, that

turns away from the beaten highway, may, to the mind of the child, lead to Tyre or Babylon ; and a distant hillside with its dark and shaggy forests may be the foreground and symbol of an unknown world.

A little later, and that faculty of the mind will be roused into activity which speculates on its own ideas, and is drawn to those sciences which are created by itself, such as the harmonies of numbers, the relations of the figures of geometry, and the laws of the human intellect. Youth and early manhood have always delighted in such intellectual exercises.

Afterwards comes the time for grappling with the real problems of life, the time for the understanding and the will to prove themselves in dealing with things as they are, and getting the mastery of the actual world. As youth ripens into manhood, realities take the place of dreams and speculations ; from "cloudland" and the regions of the ideal, we come down to the solid earth, and build houses, and till our farms, and show our ingenuity in our workshops, and seek to guide, and rule, and bless the world. We give up theorizing, and become practical ; action is henceforth the business of our lives.

We know that this is the order in which the human faculties are generally developed. And the same law has been observed in the history of the world. The preparation for Christianity was made chiefly in three nations, the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans. It was in their languages that the title of Jesus as King of the Jews was written on his cross, as if to show that they, above all other nations, would have to do with the planting of Christianity. They were eminently the historical nations of antiquity, because from them alone has any permanent influence passed over to the modern or Christian ages. Babylon, Egypt, Assyria and Persia, have contributed nothing, or next to nothing, to the religion, or philosophy, or civilization of Christendom. They were outside of the true line of progress ; it was not in them that the education of the world went forward. Whatever end they answered in the scheme of God's government was only for the time ; nothing Babylonian, or Egyptian, or Assyrian, has entered as a perceptible element into our institutions, or laws, or modes of thinking.

The Jews were selected and separated from all other nations

to receive a moral and spiritual training, such as should be suitable to the people amongst whom the Son of God was to be born. A narrow strip of land along the southeastern coast of the Mediterranean was given them, not well situated for commerce or for conquest, nor so rich as to tempt to indolence, but fruitful in the best productions of the temperate zone; a land of hills, and valleys, and springs of water, of bold mountains, and broad and fertile plains, suitable to the vine and the olive, and to the pasturage of flocks and herds; and separated from Egypt and the region of the Euphrates by sandy deserts, and from Syria by the mountain-chains of Lebanon, and so a fit country for a people who were to dwell alone, and not to be mixed up with the surrounding nations. They were to be kept apart, like children at school, that their education might not be interfered with. For the end which God aimed at was not to train up a warlike people who should march through the world, trampling it into submission, nor a commercial people whose fleets should whiten every sea, nor an intellectual people who should excel in art, and science, and philosophy, but a people who should live by faith in the unseen God, the creator and governor of men, and in whom the moral affections should blossom and bear fruit. Their history is to be read in the light of this idea; otherwise, it is unintelligible. But if we bear in mind that it was the conscience and the spiritual faculties of man that were to be educated, and this in the infancy of the race, we shall see the necessity of the supernatural interpositions of divine power which marked their progress, and the wonderful wisdom of the system of laws under which they were placed.

The great danger of the ancient world was the being brought into bondage to nature, which they saw lying all about them and above them in its vastness and beauty, full of productive and destructive energies; now winning them by its bounty and its soft caresses, as in the flowers and fruits of summer, and the gentle gales of spring; and now overwhelming them by its terrors, as in the storm and the earthquake. All the nations of antiquity, save the Jews, yielded to the mighty spell; and they would have yielded but for the power and severity of God's discipline. All of them idolized nature in some of its elements

and powers, and under some of the many symbols by which these were expressed. The Persians looked with adoration upon the sun, glorious in his brightness, from whose golden fountain the light that gladdened and the heat that fructified the earth flowed forth in endless streams. The Egyptians saw in animals the representatives of the unseen forces of nature, and to these they paid their worship; while the Greeks, excelling all others in artistic skill, carved, out of the marble, images full of majesty and grace, and brought offerings and incense to their shrines. From all these, and from every other form of nature and creature worship, the Jews were to be kept. They were to have no object of worship but the living God, who is above nature, and may never be confounded with it; the eternal Spirit, by whose will the creation was brought forth, and by whose wisdom and power it is guided and sustained.

This being the end of God's dealings with them, what a fitness do we see in all the steps of their history! When the time arrived for them to enter on their national existence, they were slaves in the mightiest kingdom of the world. A wild and trackless desert, without food or water for such a multitude, separated them from the promised land. They were without laws and institutions, except of the simplest kind, such as masters might allow to a subjugated race. It needed some extraordinary interposition to emancipate them from bondage, conduct them in safety across that inhospitable wilderness, and plant them in their own country an organized nation, capable of fulfilling all the functions of national life. In the ordinary course of events, this would have been impossible to an ignorant and undisciplined people, whose manhood had been well nigh crushed out of them by oppression. Hence the necessity for that succession of stupendous miracles which accomplished and accompanied their deliverance. An unseen hand dealt the strokes of judgment which broke every fetter; an unseen hand opened a path through the Red Sea, brought water out of the rock, and made the heavens to rain down bread; and the same unseen hand gave to them from Sinai laws and a national constitution, and bound together that confused and timid multitude into a well-ordered host. Their first national lesson was that the power, in whom they were to trust, was outside of the world

and independent of it. And so they were led into the depths of a savage desert, far down between the two arms of the sea ; and there, amidst the wildest and most terrible desolation, as of the earthquake and the volcano, and from the summit of a mountain wrapped in mingled darkness and fire, and trembling to its foundations under its creator's footsteps, they received that national code, the holiness and righteousness of which were worthy of its sublime delivery. Its moral superiority over all other ancient systems of laws was well nigh inmeasurable. No other code was ever so just, so pure, so merciful as this. None ever defended the family by such strong bulwarks from disorder and pollution, or so mitigated the hardships of servitude, or made such generous provision for the widow and orphan, or so guarded from abuse the administration of justice.

But its great power lay in this, that it reached to the roots of the conscience, and brought the inward as well as the outward life into subjection to itself. It educated and disciplined the moral faculties of the people, and made them feel the fundamental, eternal distinction between right and wrong, as no other nation of antiquity did. This gave them their noblest national characteristics. They did not excel in the arts and sciences ; they had no painting, no sculpture, no philosophy. Their glory lay in their purity of life, their moral integrity, their lofty faith, their strength of manhood, their wisdom outrunning logic, and those depths of love and tenderness which oftentimes opened themselves in their rude life like springs of water among the rocks. Men of finer intellectual culture, of larger and more varied accomplishments, were reared in Greece and Rome, but no where did humanity, the man within the man, blossom in such beauty, and bear such fruits of noble action. Where shall we find a statesman and leader of the people, to be compared with the great Hebrew lawgiver ? One so disinterested and self-sacrificing, so patient in bearing with the caprices and perverseness of the people, of such penetrating sagacity and far-reaching and lofty aims, and with such power of organizing men, and bringing them under the dominion of law ? We are accustomed, and justly, to speak with admiration and reverence of our Washington's farewell address to his countrymen ; but

let any man read the last of the five books of Moses, which contain his parting counsels to the people whom he had been guiding for forty years, and say whether lessons of deeper political wisdom, or warnings of truer patriotism, ever fell from a statesman's lips. And take, as another specimen of the rich and noble character of the old Hebrews, that sweet singer, warrior, and king, all in one, whose songs have been chanted in Jewish temple and Christian cathedral for more than three thousand years, and have stirred more hearts with joy, and comforted more sorrowing spirits, than all the poetry of the world besides. There was a man as bold and adventurous as one of the knights of old, winning his place as the great champion of his country in the very bloom and tenderness of his youth, yet loyal to his king to the last, though hunted by him from rock to wilderness as the foresters hunt the wolf, and lamenting over his death in that plaint of sorrow in which all remembrance of injury is swallowed up in shame and grief that the beauty of Israel has been slain, and the shield of the mighty vilely cast away ; a man who bound his friends to him with a love passing the love of woman, and who, saving one great crime which he sorrowed for with as great a repentance, filled a long life of the wildest vicissitudes with all that was heroic in war, and gentle in domestic life, and merciful in rule : while his harp ran from depth to height through all the compass of human feelings, and breathed forth its divine melodies for all generations.

And what glimpses do we get here and there of the social life of the Hebrews, vales of greenness and beauty lying embosomed amidst much that was stern and savage ! Who, in reading the story of Ruth, has not wished that he might have lived amongst a people where all hearts were moved towards the widow returning from her long exile, where the poor gleaned in the harvest field after the reapers, and such mutual love and respect bound together all ranks and classes, that the rich man met his laborers with the salutation, "The Lord be with you," and was answered by them, "The Lord bless thee," and where poverty was not considered a reproach ?

But we have said enough to show what purity and nobleness of life were the fruit of those old Hebrew institutions, and that

the cultivation of the moral powers was one great end for which they existed as a nation. A people were thus prepared amongst whom Christ could be born and educated for his work. In no other country could a holy virgin have been found worthy to be the mother of the Lord, and to have the training of his infancy and childhood; nor national institutions and forms of worship suitable to be the moulds of his human character and earthly life.

We come next to speak of the Greeks. On the north side of the Mediterranean, there runs far up into the land the *Ægean* Sea, studded with countless islands, and bordered on either side by a deeply indented coast. The air is pure and exhilarating, the sky most often a cloudless blue, and the temperature that which most braces up the body and the mind. Even more than Palestine, it was broken by mountain ranges which gave endless diversity to its scenery, blending grace and majesty in every form of exquisite combination. Its physical character was such as to give the highest stimulus to the activities of the people. A bright and sunny land, with a climate neither stern nor enervating, it was well suited to awaken and give scope to their intellectual energies, which also worked the more intensely from the number of small commonwealths that naturally arose from the nature of the country broken into many distinct parts, suggesting and easily leading to political divisions. The Greeks never formed one nation, except for a brief time under Alexander the Great, and that was after their noblest triumphs had been won. Each considerable city with the territory around it formed an independent state, and there was no stagnating under the overshadowing despotism of a huge central power. The Greeks were, physically and intellectually, the noblest race which the world ever saw. Noble in form, athletic, full of grace in every movement, they were unrivalled in all the manly games and exercises which at once task and increase the strength and agility of the body. Their language was never equalled in flexibility, richness and melody; the philosopher found it adequate to express his subtlest distinctions, and the poet to give to his loftiest imaginations "a local habitation and a name." And never were a people more quick-witted and versatile, more thoroughly trained to every intellectual exercise, or

more ready to appreciate every beauty of thought, and every grace of utterance in their great orators. The arts and literature of Greece were the noblest fruit of mere intellect that the world has given birth to. The mind of man seems to have reached there the utmost limit of its capacities, apart from the truths and influences of Christianity. More subtle reasoners than Aristotle on every problem of logic, and ethics, and the philosophy of the mind; more lofty thinkers than Plato; more delightful historians in simple and charming narrative than Herodotus, or of greater power in condensed portraiture than Thucydides; or poets in whose majestic verse the whole outward world lies more truly and gracefully mirrored than in Homer, we shall not probably see again. Greece became the home of beauty in all the forms of art. You saw it in the porticoes and cornices of temples and museums, in statues which wore the ideals of the human form, and in the daily life of the people, in drapery, attitude and movement; and you felt it in the music of the language, not only as it flowed from some master's lips, but as you heard it in the streets and from the laborers of Athens. The cycle of Grecian history was especially marked by intellectual development. Inferior to the Jew in moral integrity, in purity of life, and in the faith of things unseen, the Greek had a far higher culture. His language was better fitted to be the vehicle of Christianity, for it was more the language of reasoning. The Hebrew was not fitted for argumentation, such as Paul uses in his Epistles, but for the simplest narrative, for epigrammatic writings like the Proverbs, and for lyric poetry like the Psalms and the prophets. The Greek, therefore, was chosen to be the language of the New Testament; and one of the providential ends for which Greece existed was to prepare this noble instrument for the service of the church. At the time of our Lord's birth, Greek was spoken very generally throughout the civilized world. The conquests of Alexander had spread the knowledge of it to the farthest east, and it is now held by some of the best scholars that it became the common language of the Jews, and was used by Christ and his disciples. The Greeks could not give to the Lord his birthplace and his training; that was an honor belonging to the Jews; but they gave to Christianity the language in

which its glad tidings were first carried forth, and by which its earliest triumphs were won.

But besides the conscience and the pure intellect, there is in man the understanding or the faculty of adapting means to ends, which, when joined to an energetic will, is the practical part of our nature. This found its highest development amongst the Romans, a people whose forte was not speculation but action, beyond any other nation of antiquity. The Italian peninsula, on the western side of which, not far from the Mediterranean, the city of Rome was founded by a band of robbers, if we may credit the old traditions, when Greece was fast rising to the heights of its civilization, was well situated to be the seat of a great empire. By sea it had easy access to almost every part of the then known world, while the Appenines so far cut it off from communication by land with the rest of Europe, as to serve as a barrier against the northern barbarians, thus giving the Romans time gradually to consolidate their institutions. Nor were there any such natural divisions of the country as in Greece, breaking it up into distinct and separate territories not easily bound together under one government. It is one of the mysteries of humanity how diversities of national character originate; but we know that they are as striking and permanent as the diversities of expression in the human face. The Romans were raised up to conquer and to rule. Their mission was to subdue the world, and to bring it under the dominion of stable law. A robust, truth-telling, straightforward people, they conquered one nation after another in fair fight, and when they had conquered them, they legislated for them, and established one uniform code through the empire. They had as great a genius for legislation as for war. It has been well said that

"The Roman law grew into such perfection with the progress of the nation that at last it civilized a world, and its principles outlived that fabric of society, and are recognized still, even where its forms and perhaps its very name are forgotten. The laws of the Greek legislators are cabinet curiosities, and no more. They formed nothing beyond their own short-lived republic. The reason of the difference is that while the one was created as a whole by the effort of one man's thought and diligence [a product of the pure intellect],

the other was evolved by time, and sprung up with the living plant of human society, existed for the wants and exigencies which actually occurred, and therefore was profitable in its principles and most of its provisions, for all the exigencies to which all human societies must to the end of the world be liable.”¹

It was because their turn of mind was more practical, and they knew better how to deal with things as they are, that they so far surpassed the more intellectual Greeks in the framing of laws. They adapted them with greater wisdom to the circumstances of each case, and did not strike out systems at a heat, as the chemist experiments in his laboratory. They excelled in what the English call round-about common sense, the faculty which takes large and just views of things, looks at them on all sides, and will have nothing to do with mere theories. Their language was simple, strong, austere, fit for plain and true men, not so good for poetry and philosophy, but the very language of legislation and war. Cæsar’s *Veni, vidi, vici*, was never surpassed in brevity and force.

The work which the Romans were raised up to do was not so much in the world of ideas, in the region of the intellect, like the Greeks, as in this matter-of-fact, every-day world of ours; no fine play of the imagination, or excursion of the reason, but downright, sturdy blows as with an iron hammer, to break in pieces the barriers which kept the nations apart, and so to prepare a highway for the Lord. It was to make distant lands accessible to Christianity by binding them together into one empire, and subjecting them to wholesome laws. It was to tame and refine the barbarian tribes, and extend the blessings of peaceful and well-ordered society into regions where the cruelties of savage warfare had been unrestrained. And so through seven centuries they went on conquering nation after nation, till their dominion reached from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, and embraced almost every country that has been famous in history. And where they conquered they civilized. They filled every land with works of lasting utility. Massive bridges, the arches of which survive to this day, were thrown across rivers as distant from Rome as the Tagus and the Danube. Broad highways, built on foundations of solid granite, reached from the

¹ Sermons by the Rev. William Dow.

Forum to the most distant frontiers. Aqueducts, parts of which still remain unimpaired, conveyed water to all the chief cities and towns; and public baths contributed to the health and enjoyment of the people. The Romans have been well called the Anglo-Saxons of antiquity, for they showed the same practical talent, and the same unflinching courage and perseverance, which have made of foggy England a terrestrial Paradise, and are fast transforming our own wildernesses into fruitful fields.

Such was the three-fold preparation for the introduction of Christianity, and can any one believe that it was not with divine forethought and purpose that the birth of the Son of God into the world was delayed until the divine institutions and training given to the Jews had prepared a people amongst whom he could find fit entrance, and Grecian intellect had provided a language in which the new Gospel could be carried forth, and Roman conquest and legislation had thrown the world open to apostles and evangelists? Who can help seeing in these three great cycles of history, a wonderful providential arrangement to prepare for and to facilitate that mighty change in human affairs which was to be the effect of the Incarnation?

At length, when all was ripe for it, that great event, for the sake of which the heavens and the earth had been brought forth, and which had been the goal of all human history, was accomplished. *God was made man.* The second person in the adorable Godhead was born into the world in the true nature of our race, and linked his own interests and destinies indissolubly with those of humanity. He passed through all the experiences and changes of human life, and gave therein the first example of unspotted holiness in fallen manhood. By his expiatory death, he blotted out sin and reconciled the world unto God, making peace through the blood of his cross; and by his resurrection from the dead, he redeemed the body from the curse, and opened a new and endless career of blessing for man. He was then exalted into the glory from which he had come forth, but not as he came forth; for he came as the Son of God, but he returned as the Son of man, carrying the nature which he had redeemed from its ruin to be glorified in indissoluble union with the Godhead. And from the throne of glory in which manhood, in his person, was thus crowned with

honor and invested with dominion, he sent down the Holy Ghost, to be the link of union between himself in the heavens and his disciples on the earth, and to convey to all that would receive him the fruits of his wonderful work and victory.

Christianity is the product of two facts: the Incarnation, and the giving of the Holy Ghost. By the first, including in it all the acts and events of our Lord's personal history, the human nature and, potentially, the human race were redeemed; by the second, the blessed results of this redemption were, actually, communicated to believing men. These transactions were the most stupendous of all history, and their effects upon mankind could not but be most transforming and ennobling. A new peace and joy took possession of man's heart when he knew that he was forgiven through the blood of Jesus. There was a new hope born for him out of the grave of the risen Christ. A new feeling of love and pity entered into his spirit, when he saw the love of God toward his enemies manifested in the cross of his Son. New possibilities of holiness were disclosed to him in the spotless life of the Man of Nazareth, tempted in all points like as we are, and foregoing every advantage of his Godhead in his perilous warfare, because he must fight lawfully, as man, and not as God; but ever prevailing to present his entire humanity a spotless offering unto his Father.

The world had never before seen such an example of self-sacrificing love, and lowly humility, and willing obedience; and a new life was breathed into men, which had power to overturn the old foundations of society, and rebuild it anew after the law of a new creation. But we can do no more than sketch in mere outline the characteristics of the Christian cycle, and this chiefly as they are connected with the social and political life of Christendom. When the church entered upon her work, she had to deal with, and appropriate to her use, the three elements which we have described, not by any wholesale transplanting into her own realm of Jewish institutions, and Greek philosophy, and Roman laws, she being a purely spiritual organization, in the world, but not of it; but by taking up into herself, and subjecting to her own higher laws, whatever of good the world had thus far been able to produce. Springing into life in the

bosom of Judaism, Christianity retained all its purity of morals, its spirit of order and reverence, and its strength of faith. The sacred books of the Hebrews became the sacred books of the church. Their songs were sung in her worship, and the words of their prophets were the theme of her teachings. Then she conquered to her service the acuteness and culture of the Greek intellect, and the treasures of its philosophy, using them in developing her doctrines and defining her faith with such skill that the Eastern church has left us, as one has well said, "a metaphysic at once Christian and scientific, every attempt to improve on which has hitherto been found a failure." And on the other hand the Western church inherited the genius for legislation and rule which had characterized the Roman Republic and Empire, and showed equal firmness of purpose and power of organizing men in carrying on her spiritual (alas ! that they should have become in later ages her worldly) conquests.

Christianity could not save the Roman Empire, although its effects upon society were great and wonderful. It infused the element of mercy into legislation, gave new dignity to man as man through that common relationship to Christ into which rich and poor, the monarch and the slave, alike were brought within the church, and so it gradually loosened the bonds and mitigated the evils of slavery. But the corruption of the Empire was too far gone when the church entered upon her work, for the building up of a true Christian national life. It was like grafting a vigorous scion into a decayed and worn-out stock. She needed better materials than those effete nations, enervated by luxury and vice. And such were brought to her in those German or Gothic tribes which came pouring forth from their northern fastnesses in the fifth and sixth centuries, and shattered the old civilization to its centre. Savage they were in their manners, and cruel and vindictive in their feelings, but a strong, resolute, and untainted race, truthful and honest, holding woman in respect, and even reverence, and guarding jealously the sanctity of marriage. These were the new materials which the breaking up of the old Roman Empire furnished to the church ; and out of them, she reared, step by step, through centuries of toil and strife, and not without many and

great failures of her own, the wonderful structure of Christian society.

Christianity has given freedom to nations, and made despotism, as we see it in the oriental world, all but impossible. This it has done by introducing the counterpoising spiritual authority of the church, and thus making kings to feel their responsibility to One higher than themselves. It is probable, too, that the principle of representation, one of the great safeguards of popular liberty, was learned from the church, in which the election of the clergy has been, more or less, a law and usage from the first. In the very beginning, the Christian people chose their deacons, to whom the collecting of her revenues, and the dispensing of them to the poor, were committed; and there is a remarkable analogy between them and the lower house, or third estate, in most European countries, and in our own, which is looked on as the proper representative of the people, and to which the origination of money bills belongs. No Christian king or governor could be as absolute as a Pagan monarch, because he was continually confronted by a spiritual authority higher than his own. Henry VIII., ferocious despot as he was, was not so despotic as he would have been had there been no Latimers bold enough to give the monarch a New Testament with the leaf turned down at the words, "Thou shalt not commit adultery."

Another fruit of Christianity has been to give to family life a sanctity, dignity, order and joyousness which it had not even amongst the Jews. The true meaning of marriage was first fully disclosed when the Son of God incarnate entered on the work of redeeming and forming his church. Then it was seen that the earthly relationship was a symbol of a mightier mystery, the union between Christ and the bride whom he had ransomed by his blood, and with whom he would share the glory of his kingdom. In the church alone can woman be brought into her true position. It is as representing the wife of the Lamb, that she attains her true dignity as the beloved and honored partner of man, to whom she is yet subordinated as the church to Christ. Polygamy died out as Christianity came in, not so much from any express command, as because it is at war with the whole spirit of the Christian religion. One wife

for one husband, is the expression and counterpart of the one church wedded by indissoluble bonds to the one Lord and Saviour. The beauty and blessedness of the family, as seen in Christian lands, are the fruit of the light which Christianity threw upon its relationships, and of the new and divine life imbathed into them. These acquired a higher meaning, and became guarded by more sacred sanctions, and were made channels of deeper and purer joys, where the church faithfully did her work.

The influence of Christianity on the intellectual culture of Christendom has been scarcely inferior to its moral and spiritual influences. The building up of literature and art, though not the direct aim of the church, has been the indirect result of her labors. Christianity has to do with the whole being and life of man. It has the profoundest truths to present to the understanding, the most moving appeals to address to the affections and conscience, and the sublimest mysteries, and the most majestic symbols to stir and guide the imagination. Every part of our humanity is ennobled by it. It is not surprising, then, that as soon as it found a suitable vehicle in the languages which gradually grew up out of the ruins of the empire, and favoring circumstances in the condition of the newly formed states, it should have produced a literature deficient, it may be, in form, as compared with the Greek and Roman, but immeasurably surpassing them in depth and power, in the range of its ideas, and in the purity of its spirit. Homer may have pictured the outer world, and the movements of man's external life, whether in the council-chamber, in the banqueting hall, or on the battle-field, with greater distinctness and vividness than Milton; but who would think of putting them on the same level as to the thoughts which wander through eternity? Or could the dramas of Shakespeare have been the product of any but a Christian land? Is not Christianity the hidden root of what is noblest and most beautiful in that wilderness of life which his imagination has created? Could such forms of character have existed any where but in the bosom of Christian society? But it is not our purpose to dwell on this.

The Christian cycle is the last in the world's progress this side of the resurrection and the kingdom of God. It is the

preparation for the true *novus ordo saeculorum*, in which the whole groaning creation is to find deliverance from its bondage, under the manifested rule of Him who became man that in him the Creator and the creature might be made one forever. The Jewish, Greek, and Roman cycles existed to prepare the way for his first advent into the world, and for the subsequent gathering of his church; the Christian cycle exists to make ready for his second and glorious advent, when he shall judge the world in righteousness, and cause the prayer to be fulfilled, "Thy kingdom come; thy will be done in earth, as it is done in heaven." Christ will be the second Adam of the new creation, and he will have a second Eve, the counterpart of her whom God formed out of the flesh and bones of Adam, and brought to him to be the partner of his dominion. The gathering and training of the church to be the mystical bride of the Lamb, is the one great work of the present cycle or dispensation; and the next thing in order will be the setting-up of the kingdom of God in the earth, and the administering of its rule by this royal company. Not the subjugation of the world to Christ, but the taking out of an election for him, is the work which God has now in hand. This is the key to the otherwise insolvable riddle of Christian history. The early falling away of the church, and her continual failures can be accounted for only on the principle that this is not the time for the glory of the Lord to fill the earth, even as the earthly and mortal life of Jesus was not the time for him to set up his kingdom. Those who are to reign with him, must be trained and disciplined for their royal dignity by experiences of toil and sorrow such as he himself underwent. The law of the present dispensation is: "They that live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution"; "If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him"; "In the world ye shall have tribulation."

This great truth as to the end for which the Christian cycle exists, must be borne in mind if we would meet the infidel objection that Christianity is a failure. It is a failure, if it has no other immediate purpose than to civilize and christianize the whole world. But if its purpose is, as St. James declared in the council at Jerusalem, to take out from the gentiles a peo-

ple for his name, it is not a failure. It has prevailed to gather an innumerable company out of almost all the families of the earth, by whom, in the next age or cycle of human history, the rule of God shall be administered, and his blessings dispensed, and the promised destiny of humanity shall be gloriously realized.

The greatest strength of infidelity at the present time, lies in its promise of a golden age, conjoined with the manifest weakness and perplexities of the church. Men are turning away from that which has so little power to mitigate the evils everywhere pressing upon human society, and opening their hearts to the lie of the tempter, "Ye shall be as gods," which promises a paradise to the disobedient. Humanity, weary of waiting for redemption from him who will not deliver from curse where he can not wash away sin, and where he is not suffered to rule, is striving to be its own redeemer. Christianity is being rejected as effete. It has accomplished its work, and its day is over. A new Gospel, sweeter in its accents to the ear of fallen man, with no harsh and discordant notes of sin and curse to mar its melody, is sounding forth throughout all Christendom. "God has deceived you," is the serpent's plea with the disheartened nations; "his methods of blessing have miserably failed; trust in him no longer, but follow me, and I will lead you to the paradise you seek." And they are following him.

Lusting after a larger liberty than God would give them, and drunken with self-conceit, they are sweeping away the restraints of the old Christianity, and beginning to reconstruct society after their own lawless devices. The corruptions of the church have given too much occasion to this infidel work of destruction, and it is in those lands where her failure has been the greatest, that she is now exposed to the most imminent peril.

But in every country, and especially in those which are most highly civilized, the faith and institutions of Christianity are being thrust aside to make room for the doctrines and schemes of the fallen intellect; and there are already foreshadowings (as in Mormonism and Spiritualism) of a still darker day, when all that has upon it the stamp and sanction of God shall be supplanted by the ordinances of hell. St. Paul (2 Thess. 2) gives

warning of the revelation of the Man of Sin, the Lawless One, whose coming shall be "after the working of Satan, with all power and signs, and lying wonders"; and in whom the rejection of God and the deification of humanity shall be consummated, for he shall exalt himself above every thing that is called God, and shall sit in the temple of God, pointing himself out as God. This is a form of wickedness beyond the abuses of the Papacy, though this, by its corruption of Christianity, has prepared the way for it. To exaggerate and distort truth, or to adulterate and defile it, have been the sins of past generations; but the crowning act of rebellion will be the utter rejection of all that comes from God and testifies of Christ. There is a double duty resting on the church at this time, to stand up for every divine truth and ordinance which have come down to us from the beginning, and to put to shame the lying promises of the infidel by the full exhibition of the glorious hope of the Gospel. The highest measure of blessing attainable in the present dispensation must be the fruit of Christianity filled with the life and power with which it entered on its heavenly mission, and holding with clear insight and unyielding grasp "the faith once delivered to the saints"; but the utmost perfection of humanity can only be reached in the resurrection at the coming of the Risen One, and in the glory of the kingdom which follows it. The first aim of the enemy is to get rid of what Christ has already done for man in his cross and from his throne; the next will be to put an usurper in his place. The rejection of all authority professing to be derived from God and his anointed Son, whether in church or state; the denial of inspiration to the Scriptures; the decrial of the mysteries of Christianity; the elimination of the supernatural element from revelation; the relaxing of the marriage tie; the magnifying of the rights of fallen man, apart from the redemption that is in Christ; and lax views of sin and of expiation, are unmistakable tendencies of the present age, and are ominous of a time when, for the full manifestation of human wickedness before its utter overthrow, ungodliness shall, for a little season, be allowed to triumph. But the purpose of God shall stand, and the earth, which he has promised to his Son for a possession, shall see his

salvation, and be filled with his glory. The present cycle of its history shall not come to an end till it has furnished to Christ the full number of his elect, and that which shall follow it shall bring rest and peace to the sore-burdened creation.

ARTICLE IV.

THE MEETINGHOUSE AND THE MINISTRY.

THE practical power of the church is to be developed, very largely, in connection with two central ideas, viz., the meetinghouse and the ministry. The meetinghouse, as the home and muster-room of God's people, where they are to come for comfort as well as for discipline in their heavenly work, and the ministry, as the living and authorized instructors of his people into the labors and responsibilities of their high calling. The local church must needs have, on the one hand, its house of worship, and, on the other, its acknowledged head and guide to press forward its appropriate work.

How shall the meetinghouse answer its highest uses, and how shall the ministry best accomplish its design?

It is not proposed to answer these questions fully, but if we may submit a few observations that may help in their solution, in however slight a degree, we shall do all that we anticipate.

And at the outset, it seems necessary that we form a clear and precise idea of the meetinghouse; for the idea, whatever it is, will determine not a little the uses that we make of it. There are two passages of Scripture which may aid us to a just conception of the vital thing we seek, the first in the Old Testament, the second in the New: "My house shall be called of all nations a house of prayer," "Compel them to come in that my house may be filled." Taking these as our guide, it would be essential to a proper idea of the meetinghouse, that God's ownership should inhere in it. "My house" is the term which

the Scriptures employ on this subject. It is not only a house built generally for religious purposes, and specially controlled by religious people, but it is a house in which God's ownership is so involved that it can not be alienated to other purposes than his service and worship. The Scriptures never teach differently from this; at the same time the history of the meetinghouse demonstrates that the primary and prevailing idea of it has been that it is God's and not man's.

In this regard, the temple may be taken as the representative house of its kind. Its sacred character was never questioned, and the ownership of it was vested in God, both because it was built under the divine direction, and because it was forever consecrated to his worship. If it belonged to the nation of Israel in a peculiar sense, it was simply because the nation accepted and held it in trust for God. Solomon was not more divinely moved and commissioned to build "an house unto the Lord," than he was to dedicate it to him by solemn prayer and sacrifice. There was no fiction, and no pretense in that transaction. The house was really and entirely given to God. And so abiding was his presence there, that no man might enter it without careful ceremonial washings; the common people into the outer courts, the priests within the temple, and, once a year, the high priest into the Holy of Holies. No man in Israel ever dreamed that the temple belonged to any body but the Lord, or that the rights of one man in its blessings and privileges could be superior to those of another. The king and the beggar met there together, and neither could claim any advantage on account of his worldly position. And not only the Jew, but every man of every nation who would keep the law, and who would worship God, had a right to come to his house. Within its hallowed walls there were no distinctions of birth or wealth. Rich and poor were invited to the same provisions of grace. In their Father's house they were equals, and sharers alike in its infinite mercies and joys.

After the temple came the Jewish synagogue, answering a more limited, and somewhat local purpose, but just as strictly maintaining the idea of sanctity in its services, and of divine ownership in every stone and timber of its structure. It was built ordinarily for the accommodation of a town, or city, or

district so remote from the temple that but occasionally they could avail themselves of its advantages. It stood to the temple, very nearly in the relation of the chapel to the church, a smaller, easier, freer house, but no less sacred, and no less a house of the Lord. It opened its doors to the stranger as to the Jew, and offered its blessings to all, on the simple ground that it belonged to the common Father of all. And this idea that the house of worship was God's was never modified or limited among the Jews. So simple and controlling was it that the Jew never attempted to make social distinctions in the house of God. Come from what quarter he might, from traffic in remote cities, or from his vineyards, or his herds on the hills of Judea, or on the banks of the Jordan and the Euphrates, wherever he saw the synagogue, or whenever he came to the temple he recognized his Father's house, and claimed the privileges of a son.

The Christian meetinghouse of the first centuries, which took the place of these Jewish houses, adopted the idea of sacredness and of God's ownership without the slightest change. Neither the New Testament, nor the early Christian fathers furnish a hint that the house of worship was in any way secularized by a modification of its rites of worship. With the introduction of Christianity the whole ceremonial of divine service was changed to forms simpler and more expressive, yet the object of worship remained the same, and holiness was still written upon his house. The Christians of the first few centuries ever speak of the house of worship as God's, his peculiar property and dwelling. It was reserved for modern times to speak of it in any other way. It was an unheard of thing, until within the last century, that a Christian temple should not be absolutely the Lord's, and that it could ever be alienated to any secular use. The cross, crowning the church, was the symbol of its consecration to God, and whenever the disciples saw it they recognized their home, and entered it as children of God. And, as in the temple, all were equal in God's sight, so, much more, in the Christian church there was neither bond nor free, male nor female, rich nor poor, but all were one in Christ.

And this idea of God's ownership in the house of worship has traversed all the Christian centuries, and has come down to

us as fresh and vital, almost, as in the beginning. The Catholic meetinghouse, or church as they would call it, touches the meetinghouse of the first Christian ages, and has preserved with wonderful tenacity the original idea of the house of the Lord. In Catholic countries one could hardly fail to be impressed with the simplicity and power of this idea. In many of the larger churches, oftentimes without seats, will be seen kneeling upon the pavement, side by side, the prince and the beggar. It is a most impressive lesson of the levelling of all human distinctions in the house of God. These houses, too, are open night and day, as if the common Father kept open doors, that his children might ever have access to his presence. In such houses there is not only nothing to suggest man's ownership, but man's ownership is expressly disclaimed; they are simply held by the church in trust for God. It matters not, therefore, where the devout Catholic may wander, to our own shores, or to the ends of the earth, wherever he sees the steeple, or the turret of a house, surmounted by the cross, he recognizes the house of God and the Christian's home. And without waiting for anybody's invitation, or saying, "by your leave," he goes inside, crosses himself with the holy water, and falls upon his knees in the nearest slip. O, what a power the church of Rome has in this simple idea that all her houses of worship are God's, and the homes of the faithful. It need not excite wonder that the Catholic clings so tenaciously to his church, when he finds a home in every house that bears the emblem of his faith.

In outlining this history of the meetinghouse, we next come to the English parish church. And split off, as it was, from the Romish church, it need surprise no one that it took away with it the original idea of the house of worship. The convulsion which tore the one from the other, left intact that fundamental principle of divine proprietorship in the sanctuary. If every man must pay his church rents, every man has equal right to church privileges. In this respect the noble has little advantage over the peasant. Both are beggars in the house of the Lord, and both are suppliants of a common mercy. There is no idea in the English mind that is more pervading and powerful than this. We are very confident that this fact goes far to account for the Englishman's love for his church, and for

that subtle power which ever holds him true to her articles and forms. No man can come, thoroughly, under the influence of that idea without feeling its subduing and ennobling grace. Settle it that the meetinghouse is the Lord's, and that within its sacred walls human distinctions are merest shadows, and how you consecrate the brotherhood of man, and exalt the common nature of the race. Let the poor kneel beside the rich, the weak beside the strong, and both look up and say, "Our Father which art in heaven," and there will be melting of hearts, and blending of sympathies into fraternal oneness. And because the church of England, in her houses consecrated to God, teaches this prayer and this lesson to all her children, they guard her with sleepless jealousy, and hold her in ceaseless affection. And we shall see, that just as we weaken the idea that the meetinghouse is the Lord's, and the free and common home of the people of God, shall we lose power to draw the people within the sanctuary, and hold them loyal to our creeds and polity.

Up to this point, the idea of the meetinghouse is simple and uniform. The evidence is unvarying that it was accounted as God's and not man's. But we come now to the Puritan church, or the New England meetinghouse. And here, for the first time, we discover a contracting of the idea which, from the temple to the English church, obtained on this subject. The Puritan church was not so much the Christian's home, as the home of those who reared it. But still the old idea was not lost; only a little obscured and narrowed. The house was still dedicated to God, and a high character of sacredness was still attached to it. It was built in such a way that all the people, within certain limits, had equal rights and privileges in it. Frequently it was built with funds provided in the original charter of the town, or else by a common tax upon the town, or precinct, for all the inhabitants within their borders. It was not till a much later day that a few persons, or a single individual, built and controlled a meetinghouse as they would a private dwelling, or a factory. The first meetinghouses of New England were without pews, most conclusive evidence that there could have been no distinctions of rich and poor inside of them. In time persons got leave to put in private seats for themselves

and their families. And, at length, the whole house was furnished with seats at the public expense. It was a long while after this the churches and pews came to be owned and controlled by a few proprietors. In that early day, one citizen of the town had the same right in the meetinghouse that another had. And although the strict idea of God's house had somewhat departed, yet as a house open to all within the town, without distinction, it was perfectly unlimited and free.

After the New England meetinghouse came the Methodist chapel. The theory in regard to this was, not so much that the ownership of it vested in God as in the Methodist denomination, and was to be used for Methodistical purposes. It preserved the original idea of the sanctuary only to this extent, that it was absolutely free to all who chose to enter it for purposes of worship. For seventy five years Methodism kept open houses. It had all things in common. It reserved no pews for men of wealth and position. Wealth had its place in the denomination, but no place in the house of worship. Here all classes shared alike, and illustrated a practical equality before God. Under this system the denomination went ahead with unparalleled rapidity, far outstripping all other modern sects in the race for denominational extension. And one must be blind to evidence not to see that the free chapel had not a little to do with this surprising success. And it is worth while to note, that just so long as Methodism kept open house, it led the other denominations, and its prosperity was unchecked. The tide turned when the denomination began to imitate other bodies that were building houses for themselves, owning their own pews, and taking rent for sittings. And unless the denomination shall go back to the free chapel, we predict that all the enthusiasm of its centennial year, and all the millions of its centennial fund, can not arrest the backward flow of its early successes.

The modern meetinghouse of the different Protestant churches, is the bane of Christianity. It is the property of the parish, or of a few individuals combined into a society, and in no sense belongs to the church, or is controlled by the church. In a general way, it is built for religious purposes, but its pews are bought, and sold, and rented like any other household

property. Such houses are called houses of the Lord, and go through a form of dedication to his service, but they are as strictly owned by men, and admission to them secured for a price, as a concert hall, or a lecture room. They are not even owned by the denomination, as the Methodist chapel was, and used for the purposes of the denomination, but, at best, are owned by individuals of the denomination, and are devoted to individual interests and uses, so that one, as a member of the same denomination, would feel no more liberty to enter one of these houses unasked and unbidden, than he would to enter a private dwelling. What a departure from the original idea of the house of the Lord! What a mockery to God's children to call it by such a name! In the cities, especially, almost every church employs a person, commonly called the sexton, an important part of whose duty, by some singular fiction, is said to be the seating of strangers. In reality, however, his duty is to keep strangers and others out of the seats until the owners are accommodated. When this is done, those who have patiently waited may be shown to a place. But the whole transaction is so ungracious that no person with any sense of delicacy, or propriety, will be willing often to repeat it. If the meetinghouse were God's and felt to be so, would not every Christian feel such right to go within, as a child does to enter his father's dwelling? While the Catholic, or the Episcopalian, roam where he may, finds a home wherever he finds his denomination, because the sanctuary is the Lord's, the Congregationalist, e. g., has no home out of his own town, and outside of his own meetinghouse, because the sanctuary in which he worships belongs to men and not to God. In all this there is not a trace of the original idea of the church. We have lost it as effectually as if we were living under a new dispensation. And along with the idea, it is not strange that we have lost, so generally, the sacred associations, and so have ceased to feel the best and highest power of the house of God. Instead of giving it to God, and making it open and free to all who would worship him, we have rather made it common to such uses as the lecture, the concert, the exhibition, until we have stripped it of almost the last vestige of sacredness that may have lingered around it. Is it a surprising result that our houses are being emptied, and that

so many of the children are forsaking the denomination of their fathers? This process will go on until Ichabod is written upon our churches, or else we shall come back to the primitive idea, and build houses for God, and homes for his people.

In this country the tendency is to estimate all values by the standard of our decimal currency, as well men as things, as well character as principles. In the rawness of our national life this is not so surprising. With no nobility of blood, or rank, with no aristocracy of learning or genius, or fame, money has become the badge of distinction and honor. Our great man is the millionaire. The poet, the painter, the orator, the scholar, without money, are lacking the one thing to touch our hearts most deeply. No matter whether a man has mind, or character, or worthiness, so he has money he has a passport to the best society, and to the highest positions of trust and profit. And these men, finding their money so potent to secure preëminence everywhere else, can see no reason why it should not do it in the house of God. Even the Catholic and Episcopal churches among us are beginning to feel the pressure, and it is not at all certain that they will be able to withstand it. Indeed, there are signs of yielding already. For while they hold their churches, as God's, sacred, and forever consecrate to him, we learn that they are beginning to adopt the system of pew rentals like ourselves, and, in some cases, the ownership of their sittings. It is plain to see that the drift is in one direction. The meetinghouse, in this country, has broken from its moorings, is dragging its anchors upon a sea swept with storm and danger. We must bring it back to the old anchorage of the centuries, and fasten it with the old twisted cables with which God launched it in the beginning. It is not a human contrivance for which we plead. Nobody could have less confidence in any thing of that sort than we. But we plead for a divine idea, and a divine form, in the line of which, we believe, the success and the safety of our churches will be found.

And now, if we have given the true account of the meetinghouse, it is very plain that, as Congregationalists, the lesson has varied and important applications to us. Out of the meetinghouse grow all of the questions pertaining to a settled ministry, and to the establishment and maintenance of religious

institutions at home and abroad. Make the meetinghouse man's, and the ministry, in some sense, must be man's to correspond. If the house is built with an eye to gain, the minister will be put into it for the same end. That is, the minister will be chosen to sell the pews, and to sell them to the highest bidder. And so, on the other hand, the minister will serve where there is the best pay. Practically, therefore, ministerial talent will be in demand just in the ratio of its power to fill the house and profit the pew-holders, and it will be held and sold at just its market value in dollars and cents. And then, too, on this principle, the meetinghouse would invite to its sittings not the poor, nor those, even, of moderate means, but the rich, who could pay large rents, so as to enhance, at once, the value of the house and the amount of its dividends. This process would not need to go on a great while before the churches would be left in possession of the rich, and the poor would be left outside.

If these statements seem too strong, let an appeal be made to the facts. If what is called a first class pulpit is vacant, what sort of a man does it seek? A man that will draw, that will sell the slips, that can attract the wealthy who can pay good rents.

And then, again, what sort of men seek such pulpits? Just those who think they have the talent to draw, and who wish to share in the profits that may accrue. A vacant pulpit of this kind will have its eye on about every attractive preacher of the denomination, not to say that all these preachers will be floating around that pulpit like moths around a candle. A preacher of talent recently sought the good offices of a western gentleman to introduce him to a good pulpit, but was told that it was of no use, that there were ten men for every such pulpit, but that if he wanted to take an ordinary, or second class pulpit, he could introduce him to a hundred.

If the churches and the ministry come out of this ordeal unharmed, it will not be because the danger is not great and threatening. It would seem the most natural result to be anticipated that the high moral tone which should ever characterize both would be gradually lowered to the common transactions of the street, and the market. Fortunate will it be for

both, if, having timely warning, they retrace their steps to the safe and solid ground of the fathers. But for the hour, the omens are not auspicious. The evil, it is to be feared, is rather increasing than diminishing, and where it is to end, the wisest can only conjecture. One thing, however, is certain, we are going in a wrong direction, and sooner or later, must meet disaster.

And the meetinghouse is almost wholly responsible for this state of things. It has made both ministers and churches fickle and uneasy. It is, at least, a singular coincidence that churches and ministers have been growing more restless, from the time the parish tax ceased to be assessed and collected by authority of the State. While the meetinghouse belonged to the town, nobody sought to make gain out of it, or thought of a minister to sell the pews. But when the meetinghouse and the support of the Gospel became voluntary, both were made articles of traffic, houses were built to rent, and ministers were sought to draw and pay. This is the simple account of the present condition of our Congregational churches.

It would seem the plainest dictate of reason, then, that we return to the old paths. We do not mean to the Puritan Fathers alone, but especially to the original, and, we believe, divine idea of the house of the Lord. We must rescue this from its secular uses and associations, and clothe it again with its sacred quality. Nothing but this will touch and hold the heart of our people. We are weak, because we have no places hallowed by the special presence of God. We shall continue to send out recruits to other denominations, whose ideas on this subject are better than ours, until we establish sacred centres around which the reverence and the love of our children shall perpetually revolve.

But this can not be done so long as we build churches as we do machine shops and stores. The only right way is to make the meetinghouse an out and out gift to God. No distinctions of birth, or rank, or wealth should be known within its consecrated walls. It should be free to all comers. Like the Gospel itself, it should invite all, who will, to partake of its privileges without money and without price. The spirit of our holy calling, as well as the nature of God's house, forbid the setting of

a price on the preaching of the Gospel. We degrade the sanctuary when we open its doors with the same golden talisman with which we open the doors of the concert hall or the lecture room. Every Christian child has equal right in his Father's house, and none may determine for him what offering he shall bring to the altar.

No man, and no body of men, have a right to erect a house unto the Lord for "their set." God's house, in its very nature, can not be exclusive. And yet the fact is all the other way. There is just now a mania for fine churches. This is the natural result of our increasing wealth. A few men band together to build a splendid house for those on the same social plane. And then to pay the running expenses of it, such enormous rates are asked for the sittings that the poor are as effectually excluded as if a guard stood at the door to warn them back. Such houses may serve the ends of pride, but can never serve the purposes of our holy religion. What a burlesque on the words of our Saviour: "Unto the poor the Gospel is preached." Had we set ourselves to keep the Gospel from the poor we could hardly do it more successfully than we are now doing, by making it so expensive a luxury that only the rich can afford to enjoy it.

Nor do we mean by the poor, the absolutely destitute, but we include in this number thousands and thousands of mechanics and laborers, who, by economy make comfortable livings for themselves and their families, but have nothing to expend for luxuries. For this great working, thinking, middle class to take seats in our fashionable churches is out of the question. They can not afford it, it costs too much, the Gospel so preached is only for the rich.

It may be said, we know, that free churches have been tried, and have failed. It is enough to reply, not such churches as we plead for. In New York, some years since, there were opened a number of what were called free churches, but they did not succeed, and for the very best of reasons. The rich, with but a few noble exceptions, kept their places in the aristocratic churches, and left the free churches to the poor. Of course they failed, they ought to fail. God never meant to have the distinctions of rich and poor enter his house, least of

all that they should occupy separate houses. It is bad enough to have "poor slips" in our churches, which nobody will occupy, but to build churches expressly for the poor is a crying shame to God and man. Our people are so educated into notions of independence, that they will never consent to be discriminated against in the house of God for what is, at best, their providential lot of wealth, or poverty. "A man's a man for a' that." So they will insist, and if there be no other remedy they will leave the churches to fashion, and folly, and pride. The prospect is simply appalling. If this process goes on for another generation, the middle and lower classes will be outside the house of God.

And all efforts that are now making in the direction of home evangelization by the churches, and the Young Men's Christian Associations, will not prevent, nor much hinder such a result. It is very well to carry the Gospel to the neglecters of the sanctuary, into the saloons, dance halls, upon the wharves or streets, or wherever they may be found. More or less interest will attend these efforts, and more or less good will be done. But no permanent hold will be taken upon this class, and no permanent inroads be made upon its numbers or strength, until they are gathered into the churches. The meetinghouse is an organizer, it must accompany the successful preaching of the Gospel any where, and in any place. A man, like Whitfield, may produce a great religious excitement, perhaps reformation, but without the meetinghouse to fix it and hold it, it would spend itself and be lost, like a wave on the sand. The meetinghouse is in the way of the evangelization of the masses. They will not come to it, if to be made to feel their lowlier lot, and to see how wealth claims place and puts on airs before God. We can not reach the masses without the meetinghouse, nor, as at present constituted, can we with it. When God's house is free, and the rich are willing to meet the poor on a common level, multitudes will crowd the gates of Zion.

We do not wish to convey the impression, however, that the poorer classes are all eager to attend public worship, for it is not true. Multitudes of them are not only indifferent, but they are haters of divine things. Nor do we wish to convey the impression that a large number of these absentees from the

house of God are not able to pay for a sitting, and to attend worship if they chose. For they are. They are inexcusable for neglect. They have a foolish, wicked, devilish pride almost. Nevertheless, this does not lessen the evil of their non-attendance, nor render our duty less plain to remove every obstacle which a departure from the divine models has thrown in their way. We have made distinctions in the house of the Lord. Wealth has commanded advantages, and fashion and display have flaunted themselves in the faces of those in humbler circumstances until they have painfully felt their inferiority, and, as the easiest way to save their self-respect, have finally remained at home. We do not justify this. We are dealing with facts. As Christian men, we are anxious to get at the source of the evil and remove it. And our duty will not be done until we put public worship on to the ground where God puts it. And nothing to us seems plainer than that this will not be until the meetinghouse is God's, and its doors are thrown open to the world. And we have so much confidence in God's plan, that we do not believe failure is possible.

An illustration of this is found in the Methodist churches of Brooklyn, N. Y. They have, we are told, some twenty houses open and free, thronged every Sabbath, and four or five owned by proprietors and rented, which have, on the same Sabbaths, a beggarly account of empty seats. In Boston, Tremont Temple, open to all, is literally crammed two or three times on the Sabbath to overflowing, while her stately and exclusive churches can show, in the morning, a barely respectable congregation, but, in the afternoon, more vacant than filled seats. Tremont Temple is doing more to preach the Gospel to the floating and unsettled masses than any ten, very likely any twenty, wealthy churches in the city. The tide of human life surges and rushes past these houses from sun to sun, every Sabbath day, but they have no power to arrest it, or to draw it inside. Would they but throw open their doors, level human distinctions, and invite a desiring multitude to a free Gospel, the lips of the ministry would be touched with a new fire, and they would have power with God and with man.

But it seems to us that we have prosecuted this discussion far

enough to see certain fixed facts, or principles, in regard to the meetinghouse, e. g. :

1. That it is God's and not man's.
2. That it is the free and common home of the people of God.
3. That it knows no classes with peculiar privileges.

Assuming that these are established principles, it would follow that men essay a divine prerogative who claim to own a house of worship, and who dare to rent it for purposes of gain. On the principles enumerated above, men are forbidden all traffic in God's house. They may neither sell its privileges, nor may they exclude any from participating in them. They are merely trustees of the sanctuary, and are bound to administer it impartially to all classes, or they incur the divine displeasure. [See James, 2d chapter.]

But what right have Christian men to provide nice little snuggeries for themselves and their families, while the great outside world, orphaned and homeless, is drifting to the pit? "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," is their royal commission. They are debtors to the Greek and to the barbarian, to the wise and to the unwise, to give them the Gospel of their ascended Lord. The meetinghouse is involved in this obligation, for the very obvious reason that its organizing power must go along with the Gospel, or preaching would be in vain. For what other purpose does God give large means to any of his people but that they may build sanctuaries unto him, where the word of life may have free course, and the weary, and the stricken, and the sinning may find a home? But blindness seems to have happened to our moneyed men on this subject. Thus far they have shown little aptitude to invest in anything that does not bring back a dividend in kind. But a change must come. These men are to learn that instead of using all their gains in building railroads, and steamships, and factories, they are to use enough of it to furnish free churches to all the people of the land. Would they use but a tithe for such a purpose, there should not be a man, woman, or child in Christendom, unprovided with a sitting in a Christian sanctuary.

We are not unaware that free churches would affect the

question of ministerial support, quite likely would change the manner of it completely. But that would be no objection, provided the support were made legitimate and sure. It is to be presumed that with the coming of free houses, the parish anomaly would cease to exist. The worldly element, which now controls in the settlement and dismission of ministers, would be eliminated, and only the church would have a voice in the decision of such questions. In that case the church and the parish would be identical, the members of the one would be the members of the other. In these high matters the church alone should direct. Worldly intermeddling here is evil, and only evil continually. The sooner the separation comes the better, so the church will assume all responsibilities connected with the sanctuary, and with preaching the Gospel to the world.

But it is asked if the house is made free, and the parish is destroyed, how will the ministry be supported? In the same way that the ministry of the early church were, by the freewill offerings of the people. The difficulty is only apparent, not real. A tax on the parish, per capita, or on the pews, to meet the parish expenses, is just as truly voluntary as a contribution gathered by passing the boxes in church. There is this simple difference, that in the one case the man assesses himself, while in the other, he permits himself to be assessed by his fellow. But societies are continually resorting to shifts and expedients to raise their money, because men are not willing to be taxed. The annual sale of the slips is just now the most common, and, perhaps, the most popular way to do this. But this, aside from the objection to vending God's house, is very unequal in its operation, the burdens frequently falling upon those who are least able to bear them. We are aware that the subject is, practically, a delicate and a difficult one, and we do not speak confidently. We are clear as to the main principle, while the application of it would necessarily vary with the character and circumstances of different communities. If the church were willing to assume the support of the ministry by a direct tax on its own members, pro rata, that would be just, and there need be no objection to it. Or if the church were willing to assume the responsibility of the minister's support, collecting the money among themselves, or outside, that might be legitimate. Or if,

upon the first day of the week, every member of the church, or of the congregation, should lay by him in store as God had prospered him for the support of the Gospel, and that were collected at the close of every service by passing the boxes, it would be scriptural, and so would bear the divine warrant of success.

But, whatever method is adopted, let it distinctly embody the principle that both the church and the ministry are divine institutions, and that the means necessary to sustain them should neither be given grudgingly nor of necessity. The scriptural duty in this regard should be made so plain that he who runs may read. And then every man should be left to his own sense of honor, as to what is fit and right in the offering which he shall voluntarily make unto the Lord. It seems to us we have no warrant to go beyond this. Nor do we need one, for this is not only all we want, but the best we could possibly have. It disenthralls churches and ministers, leaving the one free to preach the word, and the other free to support it.

Let this be done, and the ministerial vocation would again become high and holy. The ministry would cease to chaffer for a price, and be only too glad to leave their temporalities in the hands of the people who would flock to the courts of the Lord. Some, indeed, might not be willing to trust to a support so spontaneous and unenforced. But others, we believe, who preach because they must, would hail the deliverance from the parish as a new gospel. We know of many a good man, who has felt so humiliated by what was required of him in order to secure a place, that he has been ready to throw up his commission in disgust. These men are ready to preach the Gospel, but they are not ready to surrender their independence. The course we propose saves both. The man is no longer tempted to preach smooth things, lest some rich sinner might interfere with his means of support. He will preach with a new freedom, and boldness, and power as one sent of God.

But some one, who accepts our main proposition, asks; "Could a church so constituted hope to succeed in these times?"

It could not fail, if it was right. God will see that it succeeds. Every true thing is immortal, as every false thing carries in itself the sentence of death. All that belongs to man,

sooner or later, perishes ; but God's plans, and thoughts, and works are as enduring as himself. The house of worship, as man's, is smitten with mortal weakness ; as God's it is endowed with perpetual vitality and power. The strength of the early church lay, very much, in making its house of worship the house of the Lord, the Christian's home. It is still, largely, the strength of the Catholic church, of the English church ; was of the Methodist church. Our weakness lies, largely, in building men's houses, misnaming them houses of the Lord. We offer the Gospel to men as we do the lecture and the fair. As a business operation this may be well enough, but as a plan of evangelization nothing could be more short-sighted. A wealthy parish, not long ago, exchanged a minister to whom they paid a salary of fifteen hundred dollars, for another to whom they paid three thousand. A member of that parish remarked that it was a capital speculation, for so many wealthy families were drawn into the church, in consequence, that it considerably reduced the taxes on the old members. Besides, the value of the sittings had been so raised by the change, that they were now sought after by business men for safe and profitable pecuniary investment. This looks strangely on paper, and yet the strangest thing about it is, that it is true. What a charming church that must be for the poorer classes ! A man is brought in, the salary doubled for the very purpose of increasing the value of meetinghouse stock, drawing in the rich, and necessarily excluding the poor. Such an operation is in the line of State street, or Wall street, but it does seem out of place in the committee room, or the vestry of a church, where the spiritual and eternal interests of undying thousands are discussed and decided. If gain and godliness are identical, this may be perfectly legitimate, otherwise it is on a level with the operations of the stock board, or the exchange. The evil is great and threatening, and the wonder is that Christian men can be parties to it, especially that Christian ministers can be used for ends so hostile to the kingdom of our Lord. It is becoming a serious question, as to whether the Congregational churches in New England can hold their own. Certain it is they are not making the advance that a healthy organization demands, or that they might make with an open meetinghouse,

and a Gospel adapted to the masses. If Congregationalism has any future, it will be because it has a ministry to the masses. All strong and permanent religious movements have begun with the common people. Our Saviour began there, the Apostles began there, Luther began there. The English Reformers began there. Our Puritan Fathers began there, the Methodists began there, and we must begin there, or fail. If we are to be satisfied with fine churches, artistic singing, and classic sermons, we have had our day, and are out of place in these grand times of God. Others will do the work, and take the honor. It is to be seen whether Congregationalism, with the finest opportunity ever given to a denomination to spread out and grow, has any conception of the time, or any power for the work. Eleven millions of poor in the South, and as many more in the West and the North, stretch out imploring hands for succor and aid. Here are the living stones with which we are to build. Whoso uses them will come into sympathy with the Master-builder, and success is sure.

And what is to prevent the denomination from undertaking this work among the masses? She is eminently fitted for it both by her polity, and by her history. Facile, rapid, pliable, at home anywhere, adapting herself to any circumstances, it would seem as if God had intended her for this very time. The fact, too, that her freedom banished her from the South, and so, of all the denominations, saved her from the complicity, or guilt of slavery, seems to mark her as the church that is to go southward and westward, heralding that Gospel which she has ever spoken with unmuzzled lips. Episcopacy may covet the favor of the great, and seek her conquests in the high places, but be ours the humbler, though surer, and more enduring work among the common people. Here is the most depth and richness and vitality and power, and here the divine seed will spring to the most abundant harvest.

For such a work we need no theological *dilettanti*, but genuine, earnest men, who can endure hardness as good soldiers, and in whose ears there is ringing a wo if they preach not the Gospel. The only question is as to whether our ministry are equal to the work, whether the young men in our divinity schools are fitting for a profession, or for a work unto which

they are called of God. Whether they are fitting for pulpits, or for ministering the word of life to the perishing. Give us two things and we will solve the problem of home evangelization. Houses of worship, open and free, and a ministry who preach simply to save souls, and the Congregational church shall go forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.

ARTICLE V.

JOHN HOWE'S BLESSEDNESS OF THE RIGHTEOUS OPENED.

WHOEVER has taken a journey in New England, or in any other region, must have remarked the different impression a town or village makes on the observer from the different time and direction in which he approaches it. If he enters it in a beautiful season of the year, after a refreshing shower, from an eastern course, in face of a setting sun, and all the fields clothed with a transcendent verdure, it makes the most favorable impression, especially if his own spirits share in the exhilarations of nature; but if on a hot day, under a burning sun, his own spirits depressed with languor and fatigue, and all the fields blasted by a continuous drought, the description in his note book is almost reversed by the circumstances, and though the place be the same, yet the earth mourneth and languisheth; Lebanon is ashamed and hewn down; Sharon is like a wilderness; and Bashan and Carmel shake off their fruits. On something like this depends the impression which eminent authors make on us. Our receptivities, our circumstances, the mood in which we approach them, concur with their qualities to shape our estimation of them.

The way in which we met the author of the *Blessedness of the Righteous*, was peculiar. We met him in a tranquil afternoon, under the mild light of a setting sun, with every field flourishing around, after long hearing of his fame, and with the most excited but deferred expectations. It so happened that we

never read a word of the famous John Howe until we had almost completed our seventy-eighth year. By the current writers around us he is sometimes mentioned, but very rarely quoted. The theologians of New England seldom mention him. Edwards, Hopkins, Emmons, Dr. Dwight, Stuart, Dr. Woods, rarely use his name; never appeal to his authority. We seldom find his works in our popular libraries; to us (speaking individually) he has been like the Southern Cross, no doubt a brilliant constellation, but hid behind the horizon; and shining over distant seas which we never expect to navigate. We have often asked theological men what they know about him, and the uniform answer has been, we have heard of him by the hearing of the ear, but our eyes have never seen him. Then comes the question: What is the character of that spring, remote in the desert, of which no traveller ever drinks, though gushing with crystal waters and surrounded with fruits and flowers?

John Howe was born in Loughborough in the year 1630, and was the son of the officiating clergyman. But his father was driven from that place by the persecuting zeal of Archbishop Laud. Finding no place of rest within the limits of that prelate's ecclesiastical tyranny, he went over to Ireland and carried his son with him. The war and massacre in that unhappy country forced him back again into England, and he settled in Lancashire. There his son acquired his classical knowledge, and was sent early to Cambridge. After continuing some years in that university, and taking his first degree, he removed to Oxford, where he made considerable progress in literature, commenced Master of Arts, and was elected Fellow of Magdalen College.

Soon after taking his second degree he was ordained by Mr. Herle of Winwick, assisted by the ministers of the chapels in his very extensive parish. On this account he used pleasantly to observe that few men in modern times had a more primitive ordination than himself. The field of ministerial labor to which he afterwards removed was Great Torrington, in Devon, and his abundant services were crowned with considerable success.

Business calling him to London, he had the curiosity to go to the chapel at Whitehall. Cromwell, whose eyes were every-

where, thought that he saw something extraordinary in this country minister, and sent a person to say that he wished to speak with him when the service was over. When Mr. Howe came, he was requested, with much earnestness, to preach there the next Lord's day. He did everything he could to be excused, and begged to be permitted to return home to his flock, but in vain. He was constrained to comply with the wishes of one who would take no denial. After officiating one Sabbath, he was obliged to do so a second and a third; and the consequence was that nothing would satisfy the Protector but Mr. Howe must come to Whitehall, and be his domestic chaplain. With very great reluctance he was compelled to gratify a man who would have his own way.

His conduct in this difficult situation was that of an eminently wise and prudent and good man. Such was his disinterestedness that once when he was applying for a favor, the Protector said: "Mr. Howe, you often come to me in behalf of others, but you never have asked one benefit for your own family; how comes it that you do not rather seek to advance their interest?" At one time he gave great offence by preaching against a favorite notion, "the efficacy of a particular faith in prayer," which was then in great vogue at court. But he was a man of unalterable fidelity, and nothing could move him from the path of duty. After Oliver's death, he continued about three months in the service of his son Richard, and then went down to his old people at Torrington, and labored among them till the act of uniformity took place. Soon after the Restoration he was accused by one of those time-serving men with whom every country abounds, but whom none but bad governments encourage, of having uttered something seditious, if not treasonable, in his sermon; but by the testimony of more than twenty of his most judicious hearers, he was cleared from the malicious charge.

Nothing, however, could free him from the effects of the Bartholomew act, and he retired from the station of a parish minister to be a silenced non-conformist. He must now steal opportunities of usefulness, and preach the Gospel in secret, as if he were a thief, offending God, and injuring man. For several years he was an itinerant preacher in the habitations

of his friends. In the course of the year 1665, he endured an imprisonment of two months in the Isle of St. Nicholas. When released, he continued in the West, exercising his ministry from place to place as times would allow.

Seeing no prospect of extensive usefulness at home, he accepted an offer from Lord Mazarine to be his chaplain, and went over with his family to Ireland in the year 1671. The mansion of his patron was in the neighborhood of Antrim. The demon of uniformity does not appear to have obtained so full a possession of the Irish as of the English bishops of that age; and Mr. Howe, while he continued in that country, stately officiated in the church of that city, and was admitted into the churches in the neighboring towns.

From this situation he was, in the year 1675, on the death of Dr. Lazarus Seaman, called to be pastor of a church formed of persons who had belonged to his congregation; and he returned to London to exercise the office of the ministry, but in a state of things how changed since the time of his former abode in the metropolis, and to an audience how different from that which he had served before. For ten years, and some of them peculiarly unfavorable to religious liberty, he labored with extraordinary acceptance in the service of his people, among whom were not a few eminently distinguished, not only for their piety but their talents, their education, and their respectability in social life.

In the year 1685, when tyranny was come to its height, he complied with an invitation from Lord Wharton to travel with him to the Continent; and after visiting many foreign parts, as the door was still shut against public usefulness at home, he took up his residence at Utrecht, and continued there for a season, greatly respected by all ranks of people, preaching stately at his own house, and frequently in the English church.

In the year 1687, when King James changed his maxims of government, and gave the dissenters full liberty of worship, Mr. Howe returned with pleasure to his flock, and took the benefit of the indulgence. In an interview with the Prince of Orange, just before his departure from Holland, he had been advised not to thank King James for dispensing with the penal laws; and he, and a great majority of the dissenters, complied with the advice.

After the revolution Mr. Howe continued to labor among his people in Silver street, who are said to have been a society peculiarly select. He took an active part in every thing relating to the concerns of religion, and ever appeared the powerful advocate of truth, of piety, of moderation and liberality. In every part of his conduct his entire devotedness to the service of his Master shone forth; and in the end he exhibited a resemblance of the sun in a summer evening setting in mildness of glory. He died the second day of April in the year 1705, in the seventy fifth year of his age.

Mr. Howe's person was the index of his mind. He was above the common size: there was a dignity in his countenance, and something unusually great and venerable in his whole deportment, which struck even strangers with reverence. His talents were of the highest order. The God of nature endued him with a soul capable of the most vigorous exertions, and the most exalted degrees of improvement. The capacities which he possessed he did not suffer, through inglorious indolence, to remain inert. His application to study was close and unremitting; and his faculties were roused with their utmost energies in order to attain every branch of knowledge which could conduce to improve and aid the researches and pursuits of a divine.

His sentiments in theological matters were such as would lead men to call him a moderate Calvinist. In his writings he scarcely descended to the minuter parts of divinity; but chiefly confined his literary labors to the great and fundamental principles of religion, and set himself to illustrate those important truths in which Christians are agreed. The manner in which he formed his creed is not unworthy of notice. By his skill in languages he was able to examine with accuracy the originals of the sacred code. He perused the writings of some of the fathers and of the schoolmen. He made himself master of the systems of theology drawn up by the reformers and divines of the former age. He formed an intimate acquaintance with the works of the heathen philosophers. Above all, he studied the sacred oracles, and from an attentive, serious and repeated perusal of them, drew up a system of theology for himself, which in the course of his long life he never saw reason to change.

Unfeigned and exalted piety filled the soul of John Howe, It would be difficult to say, if ever there was a better man in England. The principles of the Gospel were felt by him in their utmost energy, and he was wholly devoted, both in heart and life, to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. His great end in living was to please God, and to advance his glory; and it would not be easy to find a man equal to him in love to all the disciples of Christ, in universal benevolence, and in that purity and humility which adorn the character of a man of God.

While deserved praise is given to Mr. Howe for personal religion, there are two qualities in which he was preëminent.

In integrity of heart he yielded to no man who ever trod on English ground. There was an honesty in him which nothing could shake. He had an uprightness of soul which could not be bent from the straight line of rectitude by promises or threatenings, by the hope of worldly benefit or the fear of temporal evil. What appeared to him a duty, nothing could allure or deter him from performing; what he conceived to be a sin, neither earth nor hell could induce him to commit.

The other excellence is magnanimity; and it may well be questioned if there was ever a man in the British isle superior to him in this respect. There is in some characters a certain sublimity of both mind and heart. A Roman writer says of Scipio Africanus: *nihil nisi magnum unquam nec sensit, nec dixit, nec fecit.* The God of nature may have endued that man with an innate greatness of soul. But in forming the character of John Howe, the God of nature and grace united the combined energies of both. A greater measure of intellectual, moral, and spiritual sublimity than were united in him, where shall it be found? He had his sentiments as to lesser points in religion, and as to church government; he acted according to his own judgment, and would be guided by no other man's opinion. But his soul appears to have been filled with the great principles of Christianity, and with them alone. He loved all good men, and loved them according to their goodness, without considering to what communion they belonged. To promote pure religion was his grand aim, not the interests of a party. In his own soul, the great fundamental principles of the Gospel reigned, and formed the character of a

catholic Christian above all sects and parties, uniting and willing to unite with all good men of every church, who were united to Christ, following him and devoted to him.

Some unusual displays of divine love this man of God had received ; and near the close of his ministry, while he was dispensing the Lord's Supper, the grace of Jesus, his Saviour, affected his soul in so powerful a manner, that it was feared he would have expired, while giving the bread and wine to the members of his church, and discoursing to them on the infinite greatness of redeeming love. With those who visited him as he drew near the gates of death, he conversed as one already in the celestial state. There was something in him so spiritual and dignified, that they could not help regarding him with the veneration due to an inhabitant of heaven. His views of future blessedness were exceedingly exalted, his hopes steadfast, and his desires intense. While his earthly tabernacle was fast hastening to decay, he said to Mrs. Howe :

"I think I love you as well as it is fit for one creature to love another ; yet, if it were put to my choice, whether to die this moment, or to live this night, and the living this night would secure the continuance of my life for seven years to come, I would choose to die this moment."

Such was the chaplain of Oliver Cromwell. It has usually been conceived that his preachers were contemptible fanatics. Whatever men, and some of them high in ecclesiastical office, may have said to their disadvantage, we venture to assert, that for greatness of talents, unfeigned piety and goodness, the true learning of a Christian divine, a thorough understanding of the sacred Scriptures, and skill and excellence in preaching, none of the rulers of the house of Tudor, of the house of Stuart, or the house of Hanover ever had a chaplain superior to John Howe.

His works, in the estimation of the public, have deserved the first place in the theological library. For the last three score years, no books in divinity have uniformly sold for so large a sum as his two folio volumes. Not a bishop's, nor archbishop's writings, though there be a charm in titles, have been marked in catalogues at so high a price.

One of his most celebrated pieces is the "Living Temple." The former part has been considered by adepts in metaphysical reasoning as unequalled at the time: the latter part has been the delight of judicious Christians as a luminous illustration of the Gospel of Christ. His "Blessedness of the Righteous" is a first rate performance, and contains a vast extent of thought, of learning, but especially of piety. It displays the author's acquaintance with the writings of the ancient philosophers, that he had their sentiments so much in his mind as to communicate a tinge of the Platonic system which was then much in vogue at the universities. Mr. Howe, among others, appears to have been fond of it, and to have estimated it far above its real value; and he sometimes introduces it in his works, when it might better have been omitted. His "Delighting in God" is one of the purest treatises of practical theology to be found in the English language; and demonstrates Mr. Howe to have been not only a superior writer but a most eminent Christian. "The Redeemer's Tears wept over Lost Souls," and "The Redeemer's Dominion over the Invisible World" contain a strength of reasoning, a sublimity of thought, and a pathos which it will not be easy to find elsewhere in an equal degree. Indeed what did he write which does not bear the evident marks of a master's hand? No man appears to have understood the Scriptures better, or to have possessed equal skill in throwing light on a passage, by two or three words. These brief illustrations are like a sunbeam. And there is scarcely a writer in the whole compass of English theological literature, in whom a greater number of new and uncommon, but useful thoughts are to be found.

His style is, in many places, stiff and involved, and in some obscure; but it has a dignity, an energy, a splendor, and a sublimity which produce the most powerful effects on the reader's mind.

Besides the two folio volumes, consisting of treatises and sermons, which were published in his lifetime, there have since appeared two in octavo, the one on love to God and our neighbor, and the other on miscellaneous subjects; two on the work of the Spirit, the one, in particular persons, and the other on his influence in producing the glory of the latter days; and a

duodecimo volume on family worship. All these discourses were taken from his lips by a short-hand writer, without having been ever committed to paper by Mr. Howe, who possessed the talent of forming and retaining an extensive plan in his mind, and was accustomed to preach wholly from premeditation, and the thoughts suggested in the time of delivery. But they bear the stamp of their author's superior genius, and are such as none but a great man could preach. It is remarkable that in his posthumous works there is a perspicuity of style and a simplifying of ideas which are exceedingly striking and which the reader of his former pieces could not have expected to find. With all their disadvantages they are valuable remains of one of England's greatest men, and confirm the ancient adage, "that the gleanings of Ephraim are better than the vintage of Abiezar."

Perhaps it may be considered as no unfair test of intellectual and spiritual excellence that a person can relish the writings of John Howe; if he does not, he may have reason to suspect that something in the head or heart is wrong.

A young minister who wishes to obtain eminence in his profession, if he has not the works of John Howe and can procure them in no other way, should sell his coat and buy them; and if that will not suffice let him sell his bed and lie on the floor; and if he spends his days in reading them he will not complain that he lies hard at night.¹

Dr. Watts' has strung his lyre in his praise. He wrote in 1704 an ode to the Rev. Mr. John Howe, *laudatus a viro laudato*, of which the following stanzas are the close:

"A puff of honor fills the mind,
And yellow dust is solid gold;
Thus, like the ass of savage kind,
We snuff the breezes of the wind,
Or steal the serpent's food.
Could all the choirs
That charm the poles
But strike one doleful sound,
'Twould be employed to mourn our souls,
Souls that were framed of sprightly fires
In floods of folly drown'd,

¹ For the substance of the above outline of Mr. Howe's Life we are indebted mainly to "The History of the Dissenters," by Bogue & Bennett.

Souls made of glory seek a brutal joy :
 How they disclaim their heav'nly birth,
 Melt their bright substance down with drossy earth,
 And hate to be refined from that impure alloy !

“Oft has thy genius rous'd us hence
 With elevated song ;
 Bid us renounce this world of sense ;
 Bid us divide th' immortal prize
 With the seraphic throng :
 ‘ Knowledge and love make spirits bless'd ;
 Knowledge their food, and love their rest ;’
 But flesh, th' unmanageable beast,
 Resists the pity of thine eyes,
 And music of thy tongue.
 Then let the worms of grov'ling mind,
 Round the short joys of earthly kind,
 In restless windings roam :
 Howe hath an ample orb of soul,
 Where shining worlds of knowledge roll ;
 Where love, the centre and the pole,
 Completes the heav'n at home.”

The “Blessedness of the Righteous” is one of the sweetest, though not the most thoughtful, of the works of Howe. It seems to be the blending of a series of sermons or lectures delivered by him to his people on the felicities of the heavenly state. The original form is lost in the unity ; it is a kind of informal system, assuming a central truth around which he contrives to hang a whole system of divinity. Baxter’s Saint’s Rest probably originated in a similar way. The text is from Psalms xvii. 15 : “As for me I will behold thy face in righteousness : I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness.” He considers this life as a kind of moral and intellectual sleep, a benumbing of our faculties, a dream, an empty show from which there are three consecutive wakings. First, at our regeneration ; second at our death ; and third, at our glorification after our resurrection, each of them increasing in intensity of feeling and clearness of vision. Then comes the full vision of God. What is it ? We can form but poor conceptions now ; we must wait for the glorious experience. But these three wakings, those successive steps, at once give us an exalted idea of the final state, not only by the degrees, but each step helps us to conceive the next.

Every Christian knows what regeneration does for him ; grace prepares for glory and the disembodied state for the final heaven. Then he assails the chief difficulty of his subject. What is the vision of God, the beatific vision, and what are its joys ? He divides it into three parts. I. The vision of God's face. II. The assimilation to him. III. The consequent satisfaction. Each is considered absolutely and relatively.

As to the vision, he first considers the seeing and secondly the glory seen. Let us quote his remarks on the glory seen :

“ As to the nature of this glory, 'tis nothing else but the conspicuous lustre of divine perfections. We can only guide our present conceptions of it by the discovery God hath already given us of himself, in those several excellencies of his being, the great attributes that are convertible and one with him. When Moses besought him for a sight of his glory, he answers him with this : ‘ I will proclaim my name before thee.’ His name, we know, is the collection of his attributes. The notion, therefore, we can hence form of this glory, is only such as we may have of a large volume, by a brief synopsis or table ; of a magnificent fabric, by a small model or platform ; a spacious country, by a little landscape. He hath here given us a true representation of himself, not a full ; such as will secure our apprehensions, being guided thereby from error, not from ignorance. So as they swerve not in apprehending this glory, though they still fall short. We can now apply our minds to contemplate the several perfections which the blessed God assumes to himself, and whereby he describes to us his own being ; and can in our thoughts attribute them all to him, though we have still but low defective conceptions of each one. As if we could at a distance distinguish the streets and houses of a great city ; but every one appears to us much less than it is. We can apprehend somewhat of whatsoever he reveals to be in himself ; yet when all is done, how little a portion do we take up of him ! Our thoughts are empty and languid, strait and narrow, such as diminish and limit the Holy One. Yet so far as our apprehensions can correspond to the discovery he affords us of his several excellencies, we have a present view of the divine glory. Do but strictly and distinctly survey the many perfections comprehended in his name, then gather them up and consider how glorious he is ! Conceive one glory resulting from substantial wisdom, goodness, power, truth, justice, holiness, that is, beaming forth from him who is all these by his very essence, necessarily, originally, infinitely, eternally, with whatsoever else is

truly a perfection. This is the glory blessed souls shall behold forever." Chap. III.

No doubt this language will appear mystic and unintelligible to the man of the world. What satisfied the Psalmist will perplex him. But Christ has told us that the pure in heart shall see God, most probably alluding to the beatific vision. This is the sum of what is promised in the second and third chapters of Revelation to the seven churches, to eat of the tree of life, not to be hurt of the second death, to eat of the hidden manna, to have the morning star, to be clothed with white raiment, to be a pillar in the temple of God and have a new name, to sit with me in my throne, all mystic terms and full of meaning. Perhaps it may conduce to the justification of Howe in the use of such expressions to remember that even Bishop Butler, the coolest Christian and the most cautious reasoner, lays aside his severity and almost becomes an enthusiast on this theme.

"In this world it is only the effects of wisdom and power and greatness, which we discern; it is not impossible that hereafter the qualities themselves, in the supreme Being, may be the immediate object of contemplation. What amazing wonders are opened to view by late improvements! What an object is the universe to a creature, if there be a creature who can comprehend its system! But it must be an infinitely higher exercise of the understanding, to view the scheme of it in that mind which projected it, before its foundations were laid. And surely we have meaning to the words when we speak of going further; and viewing, not only this system in his mind, but the wisdom and intelligence itself from whence it proceeded. The same may be said of power. But since wisdom and power are not God, he is a wise, a powerful Being; the divine nature may therefore be a further object to the understanding. It is nothing to observe that our senses give us but an imperfect knowledge of things; effects themselves, if we knew them thoroughly, would give us but imperfect notions of wisdom and power; much less of his being in whom they reside. I am not speaking of any fanciful notion of seeing all things in God; but only representing to you how much an higher object to the understanding an infinite Being himself is, than the things which he has made; and this is no more than saying that the Creator is superior to the works of his hands." Sermon on The Love of God. XIV.

But the vision of God is connected with our assimilation of him when the vision is enjoyed. Here our author meets with a new difficulty. Some of the attributes of God are such as we ought to imitate and resemble; such as his goodness, justice, mercy, condescension, truth, and long-suffering. But there are others, which we can not imitate, and it would be presumption to make the attempt. His omniscience, his power, his sovereignty. Here our author with wonderful skill maintains the categorical unity of his leading proposition. Where there is no possibility of assimilation there are certain correlatives and correspondencies which even his highest and most inimitable excellencies demand from the human heart. Thus man must be assimilated to the glory of God.

"The soul's perfect assimilation unto that revealed glory, or its participation thereof; (touching the order the things themselves have to one another, there will be consideration had in its proper place), and this also must be considered as a distinct and necessary ingredient into the state of blessedness we are treating of. Distinct it is, for though the vision now spoken of doth include a certain kind of assimilation in it, as all vision doth, being only a reception of the species or likeness of the object seen; this assimilation we are to speak of, is of a very different kind. That is such as affects only the visive and cognitive power, and that not with a real change, but intentional only, nor for longer continuance than the act of seeing lasts; but this is total, real, and permanent. And surely it is of equal necessity to the soul's blessedness, to partake the glory of God, as to behold it; as well as to have the divine likeness impress upon it, as represented to it. After so contagious and overspreading a depravation as sin hath diffused through all its powers, it can never be happy without a change of its very erasis and temper throughout. A diseased, ulcerous body would take little felicity in gay and glorious sights; no more would all the glory of heaven signify to a sick, deformed, self-loathing soul."

But the most incommunicable attributes demand their correspondencies; that is, they ought to make their parallel impression.

"For instance, is he absolutely supreme, inasmuch as he is the first being? The correspondent impression with us, and upon the same reason, must be a most profound, humble self-subjection, disposing our souls to constant obedience to him. Again, is he sim-

ply independent, as being self-sufficient and all in all? The impression with us must be a nothingness, and self-emptiness, engaging us to quit ourselves, and live in him. This is the only conformity to God, which with respect to his incommunicable excellencies, our creature-state can admit. It may be also styled a likeness to him, being a real conformity to his will concerning us, and his very nature as it respects us. We may conceive of it, as of the likeness between a seal and the stamp made by it; especially, supposing the inequality of parts in the seal to be by the protuberancy of what must form the signature. In that case there would be a likeness, *aliquatenus*, that is, an exact correspondence; but what would then be convex or bulging out in the seal, would be, as we know, concave or hollow in the impression. Such is the proportion between sovereignty and subjection, between self-fulness and self-emptiness. Whereas, a similitude to God, in respect to his communicable perfections, is as that between the face and its picture, where no such difference is wont to appear." Chap. IV.

The vision of God, with the consequent assimilation, is intended to explain the nature of celestial happiness, to bring the conception nearer and make the exalted state a positive idea, and the meditation of it an influential principle, a perpetual motive to increase our virtue and deliver us from sin. We are blamed by Howe and Baxter for not meditating on them more, increasing our faith and kindling our devotion. But here we must confess to one difficulty, whenever we have endeavored to carry out their directions in our own experience. The subject is too sublime, the object is too resplendent for weak mortals to carry the great idea into an articulate development. For a long meditation there must be more for the intellect; there must be components and parts; there must be springs and branches for the mental bird to light on or he can not sustain his aerial flight. Even the eagle can not soar above the atmosphere, nor the flame of love burn without some intellectual fuel. You enter a garden: there must be walks and alleys; there must be streams of water and beds of flowers to exercise our thoughts and detain our attention. We must honestly confess that an objective heaven, whatever impression it first makes on the mind, is not the best aid to a correct conception or to the quickening of our hearts.

How then shall we conquer the difficulty? Meditation is our

duty, and heaven a blessed reality. We say at once it must be subjective, not objective. We must look into ourselves. We must find the temper which craves heaven, and is prepared for heaven. When you have such deep repentance that your sorrow is delightful, when all your past sins are turned into present monitors, when a sense of condemnation makes the cross delightful, when you go to it yourself and long to draw others with you, when your afflictions only increase your patience and every provocation prompts you to forgive, when approaching death forecasts a shadow of heaven, and every duty, springing from love, increases your delight, then you experience heaven in the preparation of heaven. The sun that you see reflected in the pool is really above the clouds. The instrument is in tune and you have nothing to do but to begin your everlasting song :

“Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea and all that are in them, heard I saying : Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.”

After discussing the satisfaction which arises from the vision of God and assimilation to him, the author proceeds to a large number of inferences, all of them natural and all important, constituting a beautiful system of divinity, the most important article of which is the necessity of regeneration. How impossible it is that the man who has never communed with God on earth should derive his eternal happiness from communion with him in heaven !

The style of Howe is not wholly secure from critical objections. He uses too many dictionary-words. He talks of the complacent fruition the soul has ; that the resurrection will connaturalize them to a region of glory ; of the primordia of this glory of God’s most aspectable glory, etc. In using this learned diction he certainly has not the facility of expression and the nicety of meaning which marks the learned terminology of Sir Thomas Browne. But his most recondite words appear to have occurred to him spontaneously. What would have been pedantry in others was simplicity in him.

His use of the classic writers was peculiar and worthy of notice. He was a Puritan and lived in the age of puritanical rigor. Some of his learned contemporaries among the Puritans thought it necessary to quote the classic authors with a cloud of distrust and a note of disapprobation. Howe, it seems to us, hit the true medium. Let the reader compare him with Gale in his Court of the Gentiles. Gale, in adducing their best authorities, always uses a tone of severity. But Howe quotes them as a Christian scholar. He uses their authority as Paul might have done. His argument is generally *a fortiori*. If beclouded pagans could soar so high, how much higher should enlightened Christians soar !

Perhaps one of the most curious uses that we can make of this enlightened author is to summon him from his sepulchre to make him bear witness of his judgment on some of those most earnest controversies which have existed in New England long since his death. Fortunately it is the very subject on which he has providentially spoken. It is well remembered among us that Dr. Hemenway and Dr. Hopkins had a controversy on the use of the means of grace, and Dr. Tappan and Dr. Spring a similar controversy on the same subject ; and these controversies have had a great influence in shaping New England theology. Even now, though the rock has fallen from the mountain's summit and has sunk beneath the surface of the waters, the whole lake is still shaken by the mighty agitation. What would John Howe have said had he been alive and a spectator to the scene ? He could not have spoken more clearly had this been the fact. After stating that the sinner will allege his imbecility as an excuse for the non-performance of his duty, he says :

“ If you were serious in what you say, methinks you should have little mind to play the sophisters, and put fallacies upon yourselves, in a matter that concerns the life of your soul. And what else are you now doing ? For sure, otherwise one would think it were no such difficulty to understand the difference between the *esse simpliciter*, the mere being of any thing, and the *esse tale*, its being such or such, by the addition of somewhat afterward to that being. Though nothing could contribute to its own being simply ; yet sure when it is in being, it may contribute to the bettering or perfecting of itself,

even as the unreasonable creatures themselves do ; and if it be a creature naturally capable of acting with design, it may act designedly in order to its becoming so or so qualified, or the attaining of somewhat yet wanting to its perfection. You can not be thought so ignorant, but that you know the new creature is only an additional to some former being ; and though it be true that it can do no more to its own production than the unconceived child, as nothing can act before it is, doth it therefore follow, that your reasonable soul, in which it is to be formed, can not use God's prescribed means in order to that blessed change ? You can not act holily as a saint ; but therefore can you not act rationally as a man ? I appeal to your reason and conscience in some particulars. Is it impossible to you to attend upon the dispensation of that Gospel, which is God's power unto salvation, the seal by which he impresses his image, the glass through which his glory shines to the changing souls into the same likeness ? Are you not as able to go to church as the tavern ; and to sit in the assembly of saints as of mockers ? Is it impossible to you to consult the written word of God, and thence learn what you must be, and do, in order to blessedness ? Will not your eyes serve you to read the Bible as well as a gazette or play-book ? Is it impossible to inquire of your minister, or an understanding Christian neighbor, concerning the way and terms of blessedness ? Can not your tongue pronounce these words, What shall I do to be saved ? as well as these, Pray what do you think of the weather ? or, What news is there going ? Yet further ; is it impossible to apply your thoughts to what you meet with suitable to your ease, in your attendance upon preaching, reading or discourse ? Have all such words a barbarous sound in your ear ? Can you not consider what sense is carried under them ; what they import and signify ? Can you not bethink yourself, Do the doctrines of God and Christ and the life to come, signify something or nothing ? or do they signify any thing worth the considering ; or that is fit for me to take notice of ? ”

In a word we can heartily recommend this work, indeed all the works of Howe, to the young men of our theological schools. If they do not sell their coats or jackets to purchase his volumes, happy will they be if generally they think with him and stop with him, but certainly if they imbibe his spirit.

He was the best man to write on the Blessedness of the Righteous.

ARTICLE VI.

THE DOUAY OR CATHOLIC BIBLE.

NEVER, perhaps, was there a more interesting congregation than that to which the Apostles preached on the day of pentecost. It was gathered from nations more widely separated than the Euphrates and the Nile. Never was there a more wonderful spectacle presented, than when "cloven tongues like as of fire appeared, and sat upon the Apostles, and they began to speak with other tongues," and preach to every man in the tongue in which he was born.

And as significant as wonderful. God was showing those teachers of the nations that he would have the revelation of his will made to all men in the language they can best understand.

He had taught the world the same truth before. He inspired Moses and the older prophets to write the greater part of the Old Testament in their own, the Hebrew language. After the return from the captivity, however, and when the Jews had so far lost the knowledge of their native tongue as to be unable to read it, the Levites, it is said, "read it distinctly in their hearing, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand it." And Ezra, and Daniel, accommodating themselves to the state of the people, now acquainted with the Chaldee tongue, wrote to some extent in this dialect.

Again, when the New Testament was written, the Hebrew was becoming a dead language. The Greek was the popular dialect of Palestine; not pure Greek, but the Greek as modified by the Hebrew which it had supplanted. The New Testament writers were therefore inspired to write in Hebraistic Greek.

So careful has God been that the people to whom the successive portions of the Scriptures were given should have them in a form to them the most perspicuous and intelligible.

And no doubt, when the Apostles went out, and came in contact with different nations, they preached, as on the day of pentecost, "to every man in his own tongue," as far as they

were able. Possibly they commenced the work of translating the Scriptures into the dialects of Western Asia. Their immediate successors certainly did this, if they did not; for Eusebius, writing only two hundred and fifteen years after the death of the Evangelist John, says that "The Scriptures were translated into all languages, Greek and barbarian, where the Gospel had gone." In the middle of the fifth century, it was declared to be "impossible to corrupt the Scriptures, because they were already translated into the languages of seventy two nations or tribes."

But the church became corrupt, began to think lightly of the inspired word, and to exalt the traditions of men. Long centuries of darkness settled down upon the race in consequence, more and more concealing the Scriptures from view, until only here and there a copy could be found. A few disciples proved faithful; and in cloisters and caves of the earth they preserved the ancient manuscripts, that in later days, and some in our own day, have been brought to light.

In multiplying copies of the Scriptures by successive translations, it will necessarily follow that the different versions will have various degrees of accuracy and merit, according to the circumstances of their translation. The early manuscripts made by the Apostles, or their immediate successors, will always remain the true test of their genuineness and value.

It is rare that the translation of any work comes up to the spirit and fulness of the original. It is more difficult to make a satisfactory translation of the Bible than of any other book, because here is an infinite fulness of meaning to be reproduced under new forms of thought. To be able to do this perfectly implies higher qualifications even than the inspired writers themselves possessed. They did not comprehend the length and breadth of the truths they uttered. They gave themselves to the diligent study of their productions, just as we do, "searching what, and what manner of time the Spirit that was in them did signify." It is reasonable to expect then, that every translation will be, to some extent, imperfect; rendered so, not so much perhaps by incorporating positive error, as by failing to reach the breadth and depth of the inspired original. Other things being equal, the greater the number of minds engaged

upon a given version, the more extensive their knowledge of language and literature, and the greater the time spent upon it, the greater will be the accuracy and value of the translation.

Trench, in his work on the revision of the Bible, has placed the difficulties attending the successful translation of the sacred Scriptures in so clear a light that we quote from pages 49, 50.

“ How many questions at once present themselves, many among them of an almost insuperable difficulty in their solution, so soon as it is attempted to transfer any great work from one language into another! Let it be only some high and original work of human genius, the *Divina Commedia*, for instance, and how many problems, at first sight seeming insoluble, and which only genius can solve, (even it being often content to do so imperfectly, to evade, rather than to solve them,) at once offer themselves to the translator. The loftier and deeper, the more original a poem or other composition may be, the more novel and unusual the sphere in which it moves, by so much the more these difficulties will multiply. They can therefore nowhere be so many and so great as in the rendering of that Book which is sole of its kind; which reaches far higher heights and far deeper depths than any other; which has words of God and not of man for its substance; while the importance of success or failure, with the far reaching issues which will follow on the one or on the other, sinks in each other case into absolute insignificance as compared with their importance here.”

Again, if the first translation is liable to be defective, the version that is made from that will be necessarily more so; and so on, as the departure is greater from the original manuscripts. Every remove will lessen the value of a translation, and there will be no means of testing its worth, as being an embodiment of the mind and will of God, but by comparing it with the best early copies extant. Manifestly therefore, these ancient manuscripts, in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek, are the ones from which every translation must be made, to have the highest claims to regard, although reference may be had in the work, and very properly, to the labors of all previous translators. Every version furnishes an individual judgment, of greater or less weight according to circumstances, which a judicious translator will respect.

Premising these general principles of interpretation, which are as applicable to the translation of the holy Scriptures as of

any other literary production, let us look at the origin of the Douay version, the only one approved by the Roman Catholic church, compare it with our own, and consider some of its prominent characteristics. These inquiries will have a direct bearing upon the value of the version, and its claim to our regard.

The Saviour and his Apostles, in addition to the ancient Hebrew Scriptures, had in their hands the first translation that was ever made of them into another tongue, the Greek version, commonly called the Septuagint. Respecting its origin we know little that is satisfactory, though it doubtless originated at Alexandria, in Egypt, about two hundred and eighty five years before Christ. It was universally received by the Apostles and early Christians, it was quoted by Christ, who gave in this manner the most unequivocal sanction to the work of translating the Scriptures into the vernacular dialects of the different nations of the earth. Respecting the value of this version, Robinson remarks, in his edition of Calmet's Dictionary :

"The character of this version is different according to the different books. It is easy to distinguish five or six translators. The Pentateuch is best translated, and exhibits a clear and flowing Greek style; though it seems to have been made from a different and interpolated original text. The next in rank is the translator of Job and Proverbs; he indeed often misses the true sense, but still gives everywhere a good idea, and his style is like that of an original writer. The Psalms and the Prophets are translated worst of all; often indeed without any sense. The version of Ecclesiastes is distinguished by an anxious literal adherence to the original. Indeed, the real value of the Septuagint as a version, stands in no sort of relation to its reputation. All the translators engaged in it appear to have been wanting in a proper knowledge of the two languages, and in a due attention to grammar, etymology, and orthography. Hence they often confound proper names and appellations, kindred verbs, similar words and letters, etc., and this in cases where we are not at liberty to conjecture various readings. The whole version is rather free than literal; the figures and metaphors are resolved, and there are frequent allusions inserted to later times and later Jewish dogmas."

If such is the character of the Septuagint translation, it is easy to see that it is totally unworthy to be adopted as the basis

of a new version. And yet it is the source from which the Old Testament of the Douay Bible is in large part derived, after suffering a still further perversion in passing through the Latin.

The Gospel was early preached at Rome, as we know from the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of Paul. To meet the wants of the western Christians, the Bible was early translated into the Latin tongue. Numerous versions indeed were made, for Augustine observes: "Those who have translated the Bible into Greek can be numbered, but not so the Latin versions. For in the first ages of the church whoever could get hold of a Greek Codex ventured to translate it into Latin, however slight his knowledge of either language." There is no evidence that the entire Bible had been rendered into the Latin tongue, at that early age, by any one translator. But in process of time entire versions were completed, each one doubtless fragmentary in its origin, and the work of several minds. Hence they differed very materially from each other. To one of these Augustine, Jerome and others gave the preference. It was called the *Itala*. Writers are not agreed respecting the meaning of this title, nor is it known by whom it was made. Parts of that version are still extant. Jerome twice revised it, and afterwards undertook a new translation of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew. This he accomplished only in part, leaving the remainder of the Bible, which included all the New, and portions of the Old Testament, as they stood in his revision of the *Itala*. These two versions, the one a recension of the *Itala*, and the other in part a new translation, both from the pen of Jerome, were in common use from the latter part of the fourth century to the time of Gregory the Great in the seventh. For he testifies that in his day "the apostolic see made use of both versions." Subsequently, the version containing the translation of Jerome became the standard authority. But it is said to have been "sadly corrupted by a mixture with the old version, and by the uncritical carelessness of half-learned ecclesiastics, as well as by interpolations from liturgical writings and glosses. In fact, the old and new versions were blended into one, and thus was formed the *Vulgate* of the middle ages."

This corrupting process went on until the changes had become so numerous, and the variations of the copies extant so

great, that it was felt to be an impossibility to recover the true text. Roger Bacon declared that “every reader and preacher changes what he does not understand ; their correction is the worst of corruptions, and God’s word is destroyed.”

The invention of the art of printing, and the multiplication of copies from different manuscripts revealed these corruptions in their true light. The work of revision could now be carried on with better helps, and better success. Numerous versions were collected, corrections were made by the thousand, but who should say, amidst the multitude of renderings, which was correct, so long as they turned away from the unchanging originals, the Hebrew and Greek? While matters were in this unsettled state there assembled one of the most important councils that was ever convened, the Council of Trent. And in the month of April, 1546, they passed their famous decree respecting the Scriptures, in which these words occur :

“The most holy Synod, considering that no small advantage will accrue to the church of God, if from all the Latin editions of the sacred books which are in circulation, it should determine which is to be received as authentic, decrees and declares, that the ancient Vulgate version, which has been approved in the church by the use of so many ages, should be used in public readings, disputations, sermons and expositions, as authentic, and that none is to presume to reject it under any pretence whatever.”

But a difficulty at once presented itself: Which one of the editions that had appeared should be adopted as the authorized text? This the Council of Trent had not decreed. “The ancient Vulgate version which had been approved in the church by the use of so many ages,” was protean in form ; each of its numerous editions differing from all the rest. It is difficult to see how the identity of the old Itala, or of the translations of Jerome, could have been preserved. No one of the existing versions was considered satisfactory. Accordingly the Council of Trent raised a committee to prepare a new edition. But the Pope interfered. They did not execute their commission. New editions however continued to appear, and in 1590 one was issued from the Papal chair, accompanied with anathemas against all who should use any other version. The successors of Sixtus V., however, found this work so inaccurate

that they suppressed it. Soon after Clement VIII. issued a new edition made by his predecessor Gregory XIV., declaring in the preface, in order to save the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility, that the errors of the former edition "had crept into the press." The Clementine edition was published in 1592, and is the basis of all subsequent ones.

It will be seen by this hasty review of the origin and history of the present Vulgate Bible, that it is impossible to determine its paternity. Almost numberless hands have added something to bring it into its present form. Its basis was the Itala, a translation from the Septuagint. It has come to us through the revision of Jerome in which he introduced, in parts of the Old Testament, translations of his own from the Hebrew. It underwent almost endless revisions and alterations before its form was established by Papal authority.

If therefore, as we have seen, the Septuagint was not worthy to be made the basis of a translation, still less can the Vulgate be so esteemed. It is largely a translation of a translation, and has had a history which of itself is calculated to bring it into discredit.

If it be said that the authors of the numerous recensions had reference, in the performance of their work, to the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, it will be a sufficient answer to say, that Belarmine, in his preface to the Clementine edition, assigns as one reason for the use of the Vulgate, "the ignorance of the original languages, which prevailed in the church, instancing the Council of Ariminum, where, out of four hundred bishops, not one knew the meaning of ὁμοούσιος, all exclaiming, "not Homoousios, but Christ." And Dr. Robinson says, (Calmet, *Art. Language*,) that, "among Christians, during the first twelve centuries after the Apostolic age, the knowledge of Hebrew could scarcely be said to exist."

With this ignorance of both Hebrew and Greek, the frequent revisions of the Scriptures could accomplish little except to add to the already numberless readings that existed. The process was corrupting rather than purifying.

When now it became apparent that the Bible could no longer be kept from the common people, concealed in a dead language, but that they were having access to the translations of

Wiclf, Tindal, Coverdale, Archbishop Cranmer and others, Rome, although she had burned the bones of Wiclf, and brought Tindal to the stake for the crime of rendering the Scriptures into their vernacular, yielded to the necessity, and caused a version to be made in English for use in the Roman Catholic church. But not from the original Scriptures. The Council of Trent had decreed, that "whosoever shall not receive as sacred and canonical all the books, and every part of them, as they are commonly read in the Catholic church, and are contained in the old Vulgate Latin edition, let him be accursed." This decree determined the basis of the new translation. It must of necessity be "the old Vulgate Latin edition," with all its defects, as no other, not even the original Hebrew and Greek, were tolerated. The Council of Trent has exalted the Vulgate above them both.

By unknown Professors at the Catholic College at Rheims the New Testament was rendered into English. At another Papal Seminary at Douay a few years later appeared the English translation of the Old Testament. These versions were brought together, and constitute the basis of the Catholic Bible, as now received wherever the English language is spoken.

The foregoing remarks will make the title page of this edition intelligible.

"The Holy Bible, translated from the Latin Vulgate; Diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions in divers languages; The Old Testament first published by the English College at Douay, A. D., 1609: and the New Testament first published by the English College at Rheims, A. D., 1582. The whole revised and diligently compared with the Latin Vulgate."

Now, even without instituting a comparison between this version and the original Scriptures, it will be evident, if the principles laid down at the outset are correct, that it must be imperfect. The Old Testament has come to us through three translations into different languages. And the New is removed by two such translations from the original Greek. If to this we add, that the last translation was made by men of no reputation, or special fitness for the work, we shall see that nothing could have preserved the truth from being corrupted, save the pres-

ence of the Spirit of inspiration, at every step of this long departure from the original sources of truth. And we shall find little evidence that this aid was granted, when we come to study it.

That the foregoing judgment respecting the Rheimish and Douay translators is not uncharitable, we will cite the testimony of the Catholic Brownson, in his Review of Oct, 1861.

"The version called the Douay Bible was made under great disadvantages by Englishmen exiled from their own country, living, and in part, educated abroad, and habitually speaking a foreign language. They were learned men, but they had to a great extent lost the genius and idioms of their own language, and evidently were more familiar with Latin and French than with their mother tongue. Such men could not produce a model translation. . . . In literary merit it can in no respect compare with the Protestant version; compared with that it is weak, tasteless and inharmonious."

Similar to this is the testimony of that judicious Protestant critic, Trench: "The authors of the Rheimish version seem to have put off their loyalty to the English language with their loyalty to the English crown."

If these criticisms are just, they had no suitable preparation for the work they undertook. With their imperfect knowledge of the English, they could not have made a translation of the Vulgate into their tongue, either elegant or accurate.

For the sake of comparison let us glance briefly at the history of our own version, commonly called King James' version, because made during his reign, and with his sanction.

The middle of the fourteenth century witnessed the dawn of the Reformation. "Wyclif appealed from the Pope to the word of God," says D'Aubigné. In doing so he rekindled the light of truth in England and on the continent. The greatest work of his life was the translation of the entire Bible into the English tongue. Our Saxon forefathers had translated portions of it, Wyclif achieved the task of rendering it all into their vernacular. But he was not learned either in Hebrew or Greek. The Latin Vulgate was the basis of his translation, while he made free use of such versions as had appeared before him. In

,this translation, imperfect as it necessarily was, thousands read
“in their own tongues the wonderful works of God.”

Persecuted by the monks, deprived of his office by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Wiclf was nevertheless allowed to die in peace. But after his death every copy of his manuscripts that could be found was committed to the flames. And twenty eight years after his death his bones were disinterred and burned to ashes, to testify to the malignity of the hatred of that age for an open Bible.

At the opening of the sixteenth century God was moving the heart of William Tyndal to undertake another, and, if possible, a better translation. “I defy the Pope,” said he to a Romish divine, “and all his laws; and ere many years I will cause the boy that follows the plough to know more of the Scriptures than you do.” Four years from this date he published the New Testament, as translated from the original Greek. This translation, afterwards revised by his own hand, is said to be “surpassed in point of perspicuity and noble simplicity, propriety of idiom, and purity of style, by no English version that has since been made.” He entered upon the translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, but before the work was completed he was burned at the stake. “Lord, open the King of England’s eyes,” were his dying words.

The art of printing had just been invented. Efforts for the suppression of the Scriptures in the language of the common people were therefore ineffectual. “So the word of God grew mightily and prevailed.” “We must root out printing,” said the vicar of St. Paul’s Cross, “or printing will root us out.”

Meantime the King of England has come into collision with the Pope, and Tyndal’s prayer is answered. His version of the Scriptures, completed and edited by John Rodgers, is “set forth with the king’s most gracious license.”

While these things had been transpiring in England, Coverdale, on the continent, had been engaged upon a new translation from the original Hebrew and Greek. This was dedicated to the King and Queen of England, Henry VIII. and Anne, and was freely circulated. Soon after this Cranmer published another version by royal permission, which for half a century was regarded as the authorized version.

During the reign of Mary, Protestant preaching was suppressed. Ministers and their flocks fled to the continent. At Geneva in Switzerland, a number of Protestant divines undertake a new version from the original Hebrew and Greek. Among these we find Coverdale, Whittingham, John Knox, the Scottish Reformer, and John Bodleigh, the founder of the great Oxford Library. This version is known as the Genevan edition, and is still in use, to some extent, in England and Scotland.

Under the reign of Elizabeth, the Protestants were recalled, the Bible was publicly read again in the churches, and by fifteen bishops, appointed for the purpose, a new translation was prepared which was denominated "the Bishops' Bible," published with the Queen's imprimatur, its title-page embellished with the British coat of arms, and provided with maps, portraits, etc. It was for a time regarded as the standard edition, though less faithful, as a translation, than the Genevan that preceded it. These several translations preceded, and prepared the way for our own incomparable version.

Meantime the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts remained, the fountains of spiritual truth, the standard of appeal in all questions touching the worth of any translation. And before the minds of scholars, and in the hands of the church there were six English versions, each having its merits and defects, according to the circumstances under which it was made; viz., Wyclif's, Tyndal's, Coverdale's, Cranmer's, the Genevan edition and the Bishops' Bible. All, except the first, had been translated from the original tongues.

The materials were now at hand for a more labored, more accurate version. The age abounded in men of ripe and rare scholarship. It needed only that their attention be enlisted, and their labors be directed to this end. It was done.

In the spring of 1603, James I. ascended the throne of England. By petition of the Protestants, a conference was assembled at Hampton Court for the discussion of matters relating to the church. It was moved by the President of Corpus Christi College, Dr. Reynolds: "That, inasmuch as the existing translations were manifestly incorrect, there ought to be a new translation of the Bible." The proposition was entertained. The

project pleased the king. It was undertaken. Fifty four learned men were appointed to execute the work, and provision was made for their support. Every facility needed was placed at their disposal. Forty seven of them actually participated in the work. For the sake of convenience they were divided into six committees. Every man was to make a translation of the whole Bible. And, as often as they desired, the members of a given committee came together and compared their labors, and from them all adopted a version which was presented as their own. This was then sent to each of the other committees for examination, criticism, or approval. Doubtful points were then discussed in a committee of the whole. "By this arrangement, every part of the Bible was most closely scrutinized at least fourteen times." By a process so thorough, and continued through a period of about five years, the work was brought to a close, the most important work in the line of translation that was ever accomplished. It was printed in 1611, with the following title :

"The Holy Bible, containing the Old Testament and the New ; Newly translated out of the original tongues : and with the former translations diligently compared and revised ; by his Majesty's special commandment. Appointed to be read in the churches."

Two centuries and a half have passed since this work was completed, during which the original languages of the Old and New Testaments have been most carefully studied ; Bible lands have been explored by the ripest scholars ; Bible customs and manners have been diligently compared with the stereotyped habits of the Orientals ; and the literatures of ancient peoples have been deciphered, putting the work of these translators to the most searching tests. But not one grave or essential error has been detected.

It will not be pretended that the work is faultless, for it is human. It can not be supposed that it represents all the fulness of the original. This no translation, probably, can do. But it is believed to come nearer to it than any other translation that has ever been made.

Taking the labors of the Dean of Winchester, Richard Chenevix Trench, in his work on "Bible Revision," as the test of what faults the ripest scholarship can find in it, they

appear singularly few and comparatively harmless. Having shown that the translators fell into some few grammatical errors, failed occasionally to adopt the best rendering, even when it was before them in some previous translation, and in a small number of instances "wholly or partially mistranslated," he bears the following unequivocal testimony to the faithfulness, accuracy and worth of their labors :

" There is often a sense of something ungenerous, if not actually unjust, in passing over large portions of our version, where all is clear, correct, lucid, happy, awaking continual admiration by the rhythmic beauty of the periods, the instinctive art with which the style rises and falls with the subject, the skilful surmounting of difficulties the most real, the diligence with which almost all which was happiest in preceding translations has been retained and embodied in the present, the constant solemnity and seriousness which, by some nameless skill, is made to rest upon all ; in passing over all this and much more with a few general words of recognition, and then stopping short and urging some single blemish or inconsistency, and dwelling upon and seeming to make much of this, which often in itself is so little. For the flaws pointed out are frequently so small and so slight, that it might almost seem as if the objector had armed his eye with a microscope for the purpose of detecting that which otherwise would have escaped notice, and which, even if it were faulty, might well have been suffered to pass by unchallenged and lost sight of in the general beauty of the whole. . . . In respect of words, we recognize the true *delectus verborum* on which Cicero insists so earnestly, and in which so much of the charm of style consists. All the words used are of the noblest stamp, alike removed from vulgarity and pedantry ; they are neither too familiar nor on the other side not familiar enough ; they never crawl on the ground, as little are they stilted and far-fetched. And then how happily mixed and tempered are the Anglo-Saxon and Latin vocables ! . . . One of the most effectual means by which our translators have attained their happy felicity in diction, while it must diminish to a certain extent their claims to absolute originality, enhances in a far higher degree their good sense, moderation and wisdom. I allude to the extent to which they have availed themselves of the work of those who went before them, and incorporated their work into their own, everywhere building, if possible, on the old foundations, and displacing nothing for the mere sake of change. It has thus come to pass that our version, besides having its own

felicities, is the inheritor of the felicities in language of all the translations which went before."

If to this testimony we add that of the Catholic Brownson already quoted, we shall have no occasion to doubt the incomparable superiority of this translation over that of the Rheimish and Douay translators.

In his *Lectures on the English Language*, George P. Marsh remarks respecting this version, that

"It has now, for more than two centuries, maintained its position as an oracular expression of religious truth, and at the same time as the first classic of our literature, the highest exemplar of purity and beauty of language existing in our speech. . . . Most successful were the translators in making it a summing up of the linguistic equations solved in three centuries of biblical exposition, an anthology of all the beauties developed in the language during its historical existence."

The truthfulness of this testimony respecting the language of King James' version has been very generally acknowledged, not only by Protestant but by Catholic writers. And in the particulars here referred to, it stands out in very marked contrast with the Douay version, whose very frequent and prominent defects led Trench to affirm that the authors of that version "seem to have put off their loyalty to the English language with their loyalty to the English crown."

It can not be affirmed, of course, that the "authorized version" is perfect in all respects. This would have required a miracle at every stage of the work. It would be strange if the accurate and scholarly criticism of two centuries and a half had not revealed some blemishes in it, notwithstanding the care and learning of the translators. But like the spots on the sun's disc, they by no means obscure its brightness. We need not close our eyes to them. It is a laudable desire to have them removed. And for a few years past that desire has been gaining strength, and the question of a revision of the existing text has been much talked of.

None but those who have denominational interests in view will think of remedying the existing defects by a new translation. "To attempt a new translation of the Bible," says

Marsh, "in the hope of finding within the compass of the English language a clearer, a more appropriate, or a more forcible diction than that of the standard version, is to betray an ignorance of the capabilities of our native speech, with which it would be in vain to reason." But a revision in the spirit of the translators of our version, though by no means as extensive as theirs, would remove some acknowledged defects. They say of their work: "We never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one, but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our marke." A revision removing acknowledged blemishes would employ itself, as Trench has shown, in correcting some minor errors of Greek grammar; in adopting in some instances preferable renderings, many of which were suggested by the translators themselves, and are already in the margin; in substituting more modern words for those that have become obsolete since the translation was made, numbering as Marsh estimates not over two hundred and fifty; and in correcting a few words wholly or partially mistranslated. Of these last Trench has selected the prominent ones, and they are less in his judgment than a score, only one of which inculcates any doctrinal error. Respecting this passage, Col. i. 15, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature," he remarks: "This is one of the very few renderings in our version, I know not whether the only one, which obscures a great doctrinal truth, and, indeed, worse than this, seems to play into the hands of Arian error." But this rendering, which seems to include Christ in the creation of God, is corrected by the passage itself which affirms that he was "before all things," and that "by him were all things created."

In respect to the class of words which are imperfectly rendered, it will sometimes happen that the Romish translation is preferable to our own. This we are most happy to acknowledge. For example: the translation which we find here of the Greek disjunctive by "or" instead of "and," as in our version, in 1 Cor. xi. 27, is evidently correct: "Whoever shall eat this bread and (or) drink this cup of the Lord unworthily,

shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." "True, some good manuscripts read 'and' (*καὶ*)," says Olshausen, "but without doubt 'or' (*ἢ*) is preferable as the more usual form."

Matt. x. 16, is better rendered by the Rheimish translators, "simple as doves," rather than "harmless as doves," as in our version, which however has simple in the margin, according to Wiclid. There can be no doubt but they have adopted a better translation of Matt. xiii. 25, than our own: "But while men were asleep his enemy came and oversowed cockle among the wheat." The manuscripts differ, it is true, but the preponderance is in favor of *ἐπεισπειρεν*, over-sowed, rather than *σπειρεν*, sowed." See Alford's Gr. Test., *in loco*.

So again the rendering of Mark vi. 20, is preferable to our own: "Herod feared John, and kept him," that is, from the malice of Herodias who was seeking occasion to kill him. The margin of our version has "kept him, or saved him." Either of these would have been preferable in the text to "observed him."

The rendering of James i. 26, "If any man think himself to be religious," is far better than ours: "If any man seem to be"; the reference being to the man's own estimate of himself, and not at all to the judgment of others.

But while the translation of here and there a word is preferable to our own, as would very naturally occur, it will stand no comparison with it, as a whole, in purity of diction, and freedom from grave doctrinal errors.

One of the first things that arrests our attention in opening the Catholic Bible is the addition of the following books and parts of books, that are not found in our own: Tobias, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, Baruch, First and Second Maccabees, six and a half chapters added to Esther, and two and a half added to the book of Daniel. They have been termed Apocryphal, or The Apocrypha—hidden, secreted, mysterious, because, says Augustine: "Their original is obscure, they are destitute of proper testimonials, their authors being unknown, and their characters either heretical or suspected." Here, however, they are ranked among the canonical books, and esteemed of equal authority. But the question will be asked, What is the evidence that they are not inspired books? We answer:

1. Their writers did not claim to be inspired. The first and second Maccabees are regarded as the most important of these added books, being valuable, especially the first, as ancient history, having been "written with great accuracy and fidelity." And yet their inspiration is distinctly disclaimed. In the first book, it is said, that at the time it was written, there was no prophet in Israel. "They laid up the stones in the mountain of the temple till there should come a prophet, and give answer concerning them." iv. 46. And again it is said: "There was made great tribulation in Israel, such as was not since the day that there was no prophet seen in Israel." ix. 27.

At the close of the second book we read: "If I have done well, and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired. But if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me." xv. 39. This is not the language of one claiming to be inspired. It is not after the manner of the writers of the inspired books. Valuable ancient history these books may be, but they are not to be regarded as Scripture.

2. The Apocryphal books never constituted a part of the Hebrew Bible. They were written after the age of Malachi, and when there is no reason to suppose there was any prophet in Israel. The Jews never acknowledged them to be inspired books, though some portions contained accredited history, and others, as "The Book of Wisdom," and "Ecclesiasticus" eminently wise and sententious proverbs.

3. The writers of the New Testament never quoted the Apocrypha. This must be regarded as very significant. They were under the spirit of inspiration. They were continually quoting the Old Testament as contained in the Hebrew Scriptures; more than five hundred instances might be cited, but they made no account of these Apocryphal books. This entire neglect, by the inspiring Spirit, can be regarded in no other light than as a witness against their inspiration.

4. There is the clearest historic evidence that the Old Testament Scriptures, as read, quoted and commended by Christ and the Apostles, did not contain the Apocrypha. When Christ said to his hearers, "Search the Scriptures," he alluded to a definite book, or collection of writings, which could be referred to with as much precision as the Scriptures of the present day.

The term had a definite meaning, embracing so much, no more. When he met his disciples after his resurrection, he said to them, " All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me." He comprised the entire collection of the sacred writings in the three-fold division, " Law of Moses," " Prophets," and " Psalms."

Luke casually referred to the same classification. Speaking of the discourse of Christ to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, he says : " Beginning at Moses, and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." Here the ~~w~~ings of Moses and the Prophets, and certain other portions are referred to, as constituting " all the Scriptures." Now " the Law," or " Moses," comprised the Pentateuch, the first five books which Moses wrote ; " The Prophets" embraced the prophetical and remaining historical portions which were written by them ; and " the Psalms" was an abbreviated expression for the poetical books. Was the Apocrypha included in these three divisions, or did it originate after the Old Testament canon was complete ?

Ecclesiasticus, one of the Apocryphal books, was written about one hundred and eighty years before Christ, by one Jesus, the son of Sirach, of Jerusalem. It was written in Hebrew, and translated by his grandson into Greek about half a century later. In his preface to his translation the grandson of Sirach says : " My grandfather, Jesus, after he had given himself to a diligent reading of the Law and the Prophets, and the other books of the Fathers, had a mind to write something himself." Here, it will be seen, he refers to the Scriptures as they were known in his day, and which his grandfather had studied, in almost the same language as Christ and Luke, marking accurately the same threefold division of the books, " The Law, the Prophets, and the other books of the Fathers." Three times is this classification of the sacred books referred to in his preface, though occupying less than half a page. But his grandfather's book, Ecclesiasticus, was not contained in either of these departments, since he did not write it until " after he had given himself to a diligent reading of these."

It is equally evident that the first edition of the Septuagint

could not have contained it. For that translation of the old Hebrew Scriptures into Greek was made, as we have seen, about two hundred and eighty five years before Christ, or one hundred years before the son of Sirach wrote, and one hundred and fifty years before his work was translated into Greek.

Perhaps we may find something in the book itself which will give us the opinion of the son of Sirach concerning the Scriptures as he studied them.

Referring to Moses he says, (chap. xlv. 6), "He [God] gave him commandments before his face, and a law of life and instruction, that he might teach Jacob his covenant, and Israel his judgments." Here is an obvious reference to the first of the three divisions of the sacred book, the Law of Moses. Referring to others of the ancients he says, (chap. xliv. 3), "They gave counsel by their understanding in prophecies," which include the second division. Eulogizing others, he remarks, (chap. xliv. 5), "They sought out the melody of music, they composed poems in writings." Here is a reference no less obvious to the Psalms, and other poetical portions of the Scriptures. The son of Sirach was familiar with the classification of the books of the Old Testament. It was the same as in the age of Christ and his Apostles. The canon had been completed in his day more than two hundred years, or since the days of Malachi. Neither he nor his grandson claimed that *his* writings ought to have a place there.

Josephus, who was born only a few years after the crucifixion of Christ, and who was the most reliable historian of that age, refers to the same threefold division of the books of the Scriptures, and marks accurately the time when the Old Testament canon was regarded as complete. "This period," [comprised in the five books of Moses] "lacks but little of three thousand years. From the death of Moses until the reign of Artaxerxes, the prophets have described the things which were done during the age of each one respectively, in thirteen books. The remaining four contain hymns to God, and rules of life for men."

Having made this reference to Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, he adds: "From the time of Artaxerxes, moreover, until our present period, all occurrences have been written

down, but they are not regarded as entitled to like credit with those which precede them, because there was no certain succession of prophets."

Here seems to be a distinct reference to the books called the Apocrypha, but in his age, which was the age of the Apostles, they were not regarded as inspired. There had been no accredited prophet from the time of Artaxerxes, whose reign extended from four hundred and sixty four to four hundred and twenty four years before Christ. This was about the age of the prophet Malachi.

Advancing now one step further, we come to distinct catalogues of the books of the Bible. In a letter of Mileto, a bishop of Sardis, to his brother, about A. D. 170, he says: "Making a journey into the East, I have arrived at the place where these writings were proclaimed and translated. I have learned accurately the books of the Old Testament, which I here arrange and transmit to you." Then follow the names of all the books as they are found in the Hebrew Scriptures, and in our own version, with the exception of Nehemiah and Esther. Not one of the Apocryphal books is included. Besides, there is presumptive evidence, in the order of the books as given in his list, and in the classification of the books of Samuel as I and II Kings, that he drew up his catalogue from the Septuagint version rather than from the Hebrew. At any rate, the evidence is clear, that down to the close of the second century, the church at Jerusalem and vicinity accepted no one of the books as authentic that is contained in the Apocrypha. The earliest editions of the Septuagint, those used by Christ and his Apostles, did not contain them. They were not a part of "the Scriptures," which Christ commanded his hearers to "search," and for "searching which daily," Luke commended the Bereans.

A question then arises, and it is an interesting one in this connection, When were the Apocryphal books introduced into the canon, and for what purpose? Light will be thrown upon this question by the following facts.

Origin, writing in the third century, mentions the first Book of Maccabees, but "expressly separates it from the canonical books." Hilary, a cotemporary, says, at the close of a cata-

logue of the books, "to some it seems good to add Tobit and Judith." The question respecting the introduction of other books was beginning to be discussed. This was in the third century.

Athanasius, who wrote near the beginning of the fourth century, expresses the "fear that the simple may wander away from their simplicity and purity, by reason of the craftiness of certain men, and finally may begin to take to themselves the books called Apocryphal, being deceived by their likeness to the true books."

Speaking of books which are "not canonical," he mentions, "The Wisdom of Solomon, The Wisdom of Sirach [Ecclesiasticus], Esther, Judith, and Tobit." For some unknown reason, Esther, though found in the Hebrew Scriptures, was here spoken of as "not canonical." Mileto, as we have seen, also omitted it in the former century from his list.

About the middle of this century, Cyril of Jerusalem included Baruch in his catalogue, and the council of Laodicea decreed that it "ought to be read." Epiphanius speaks of the Wisdom of Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon as "doubtful," and of certain other books as "Apocryphal."

Later in the century, we find Jerome and Rufinus opposing the introduction of these Apocryphal books. This of itself is sufficient evidence that the early editions of the Vulgate, which took shape under the pen of Jerome, did not contain these books. He would not have introduced books into the canon while openly opposing their introduction. But in the last decade of this century, two provincial councils, the one at Hippo, and the other at Carthage, declared The Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and First and Second Maccabees to be canonical.

There is another source of evidence. During this century the Armenians were converted to Christianity. And when, early in the following century, 411, the Scriptures were translated into their tongue from the Septuagint version, the Apocrypha was not included. As late as the commencement of the fifth century, therefore, though certain writers and certain provincial councils had declared in favor of these books, the most

authentic editions of the Septuagint did not contain them. The Armenian church has never considered them to be canonical.

Such, in brief, is the nature of the evidence that proves conclusively that it was not until about the commencement of the fifth century that the Apocryphal books were introduced into the sacred canon. Christ and his Apostles, and the united church of the first and second centuries rejected them. In the third they began to take rank as important ecclesiastical but uninspired books. In the fourth they were spoken of by individuals and councils as worthy to be ranked among the inspired books. In the fifth, and later, they were foisted into the sacred text. From the Septuagint, or Greek version, as thus augmented by the addition of seven entire books, and several chapters added to two others, the Vulgate was translated; and this, as we have seen, was made the basis of the Douay or Catholic translation in the sixteenth century.

Such being the origin of the Apocryphal books, and the circumstances of their introduction to the canon, we are compelled to regard them as without authority, uninspired, and uncanonical, and therefore as necessarily vitiating any version of which they form a part.

It is time to direct our attention to the text of this Douay version, in order to point out some of its prominent defects.

1. It is corrupted by the characteristics of the Apocrypha. Passing by the uncanonical character of these books, there are many passages in them especially objectionable. But these have always given them importance in the eyes of Romanists, because justifying doctrines and customs which by the Protestant church are deemed heretical.

They abound in extravagant stories, and marvellous events, which favor the tendency in the Papal church to multiply signs and wonders, and miracles, those characteristics of the "man of sin" as described by the Apostle Paul. For example: The History of Bel and the Dragon; Habbaccuc's journey through the air to Babylon; the miraculous movement of the tabernacle and ark, as it followed Jeremiah into the wilderness; the assassination of Holofernes by the hand of Judith, and the lascivious stories of Tobias and Susanna.

They favor the doctrine of justification by works, without

faith in Christ. Thus we read in Ecclesiasticus xxxv. 3 : "To depart from injustice is to offer a propitiatory sacrifice for injustices, and a begging of pardon for sins." And in Tobias xii. 8, 9, "Prayer is good with fasting and alms, more than to lay up treasures of gold. For alms delivereth from death, and the same is that which purgeth away sins, and maketh to find mercy, and life everlasting."

By such passages the doctrine of justification "by grace through faith" is discarded, and penances, alms and prayers are set forth as the procuring cause of everlasting life.

Prayers for the dead also are commended in 2 Mac. xii. 42-46, where it is said that Judas Maccabeus "sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead," who had fallen in battle. And it is added : "It is therefore a wholesome and holy thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins."

This passage is accompanied, in the version which was authorized by Archbishop Hughes to be used by the Catholics in this country, by the following note : "Here is an evident and undeniable proof of the practice of praying for the dead under the old law, which was then strictly observed by the Jews, and consequently could not be introduced at that time by Judas, their chief and high priest, if it had not been always their custom." A passage so important as this, for a church that derives an immense revenue from its masses for the dead, could not fail to be accounted important. It is easy to see one reason, at least, why the book that contains it was introduced into the catalogue of inspired writings.

But turning from the Apocrypha to the characteristics of this version as affected by the uncritical labors of the translators, we shall find many things that mar it sadly, and render it an imperfect exponent of the mind and will of God. Among these we may mention,

2. The translation is harsh and inelegant, abounding in obsolete and untranslated words. It bears no comparison, in these respects, with King James' version, as any one can see by turning to any chapter and placing them side by side. This is especially true of the New Testament. These characteristics were well described by Brownson when he said : "In literary merit it

can in no respect compare with the Protestant version ; compared with that it is weak, tasteless and inharmonious." They led Trench to say that, "The authors of the Rheimish version seem to have put off their loyalty to the English language with their loyalty to the English crown."

Selecting a few passages almost at random, we read, "If thy right hand scandalize thee." Matt. v. 30. "Take heed that ye do not your justice before men to be seen by them." Matt. vi. 1. "And when you are praying speak not much, as the heathens." Matt. vi. 7. "If thine eye be single thy whole body shall be lightsome. But if thine eye be evil thy whole body shall be darksome." Matt. vi. 22, 23. "And on the first day of the azymes the disciples came to Jesus saying: Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the pasch?" Matt. xxvi. 17. The word for passover in the Old Testament in this version is phase. Thus in the passage describing its institution, Ex. xii. 11: "It is the phase (that is the passage) of the Lord." In the Old Testament it is uniformly translated phase, in the New, pasch.

"Purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new paste, as you are unleavened." 1 Cor. v. 11. "For Christ our pasch is sacrificed." 1 Cor. v. 7. "And it came to pass when the the days of his assumption were accomplished." Luke ix. 51. "The fruit of the spirit is longaminity." Gal. v. 22. "Holocausts for sin did not please thee." Heb. x. 6. "The chalice of benediction." 1 Cor. x. 16. "But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost." Jno. xiv. 26. "And when the evening was now come, because it was the parasceve, that is, the day before the Sabbath." Mark xv. 42. "He who soweth sparingly shall also reap sparingly ; and he who soweth in blessings, shall also reap of blessings." 2 Cor. ix. 6. "Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice." Rom. iv. 3. "You are made void of Christ, you who are justified in the law ; you are fallen from grace. For we in spirit, by faith, wait for the hope of justice." Gal. v. 4, 5. "You are fellow citizens with the saints and the domestics of God." Eph. ii. 19. "Of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named." Eph. iii. 15. "And that every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of the Father."

Phil. ii. 11. "Who shall suffer eternal punishment in destruction from the face of the Lord." 2 Thess. i. 9. "Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many." Heb. ix. 28. "We are not the children of withdrawing unto perdition." Heb. x. 39. "And they sung as it were a new canticle before the throne. And no man could say the canticle," see Rev. xiv. 3. "He that hurteth let him hurt still, and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still." Rev. xxii. 11.

Of such weak and imperfect translations this version is full. They occur on every page, confirming the judgment of Brownson respecting the translation: "They were learned men, but had to a great extent lost the genius and idioms of their own language, and were evidently more familiar with Latin and French than with their mother tongue." But why need they have left so many words untranslated, words which express nothing to the English ear? A very large number of passages are darkened by this neglect, if not rendered entirely unintelligible to the common mind.

But the late editions of the Douay, (from one of which, approved by John Hughes, Bishop of New York, 1844, these examples have been taken,) give us no correct conception of the imperfection of the Rheimish New Testament as it came from the hands of the first translators. The Papal church has published no edition for about two hundred and fifty years which retains their translation entire.

As a specimen of the imperfect manner in which they performed their work, and of the changes that have crept into every chapter, and almost every verse since the work came from their hands, let us place side by side several passages from the text of the Rheimish doctors, and the modern edition approved by Bishop Hughes.

EDITION OF 1582.

Mk. v. 22. "And there cometh one of the archsynagogues, named Jairus.

Mk. v. 40-42. "And they de-rided him. But he having put forth all, taketh the father and mother of

EDITION OF 1844.

"And there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue named Jairus."

"And they laughed him to scorn. But he having put them all out, taketh the father and mother of the

the wench, [Gr. *πανδία* or called daughter v. 23] and them that were with him, and they go in where the wench was lying. And holding the wench's hand, he saith to her, Talitha cumi, which is being interpreted, Wensh, I say to thee, arise. And forthwith the wench rose up and walked."

Ac. ix. 20, 21. "And incontinent entering into the synagogues, he preached Jesus, that this is the Son of God. And all that heard were astonished, and said, Is not this he that expugned in Jerusalem, those that invocated this name?"

1 Cor. v. 6-8. "Know you not that a little leaven corrupteth the whole paste? Purge the old leaven that you may be a new paste as you are azymes. For our pasch, Christ is immolated. Therefore let us feast, not in the old leaven, nor in the leaven of malice and wickedness, but in the azymes of sincerity and verity."

1 Cor. xv. 54. "This corruptible must do on incorruption, and this mortal do on immortality."

Eph. iii. 11. "According to the predefinition of worlds, which he made in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Eph. iv. 30. "And contristate not the holy Spirit of God: in which you are signed unto the day of redemption."

1 Tim. vi. 20. O Timothy, keep the depositum, avoiding the profane novelties of voices, and oppositions of falsely called knowledge."

2 Tim. i. 12, 14. "I am sure that he is able to keep my depositum unto that day. Keep the good depositum by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us."

damsel and them that were with him, and entereth in where the damsel was lying. And taking the damsel by the hand, he saith to her: Talitha-cumi, which is, being interpreted; damsel, I say to thee arise. And immediately the damsel rose up and walked."

"And immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that he is the son of God. And all that heard him were astonished, and said: Is not this he who persecuted in Jerusalem those that called on this name?"

"Know ye not that a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump. Purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new paste, as you are unleavened. For Christ our pasch is sacrificed. Therefore let us feast, not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

"This corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal must put on immortality."

"According to the eternal purpose, which he made in Christ Jesus our Lord."

"And grieve not the holy Spirit of God; whereby you are sealed unto the day of redemption."

"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane novelties of words, and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called."

"I am certain he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day. Keep the good thing committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in us."

Heb. ix. 3. "But after the second veil, the tabernacle, which is called sanctum sanctorum."

1 Pet. ii. 5. "Be ye also yourselves superedified as it were living stones, spiritual houses, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual hosts."

Rev. i. 10. "I was in the spirit on the Dominical day."

"And after the second veil, the tabernacle, which is called the Holy of Holies."

"Be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices."

"I was in the spirit on the Lord's day."

These passages are sufficient to show the changes that have been made in the Rheimish Testament since it came from the hand of its translators. The most careless reading will show any one that they are improvements upon the old translation, and in almost all instances the changes are approximations to the version of King James. And it would not be too much to say, probably, respecting the number of the changes, that they outnumber the verses of the whole New Testament. The felt necessity for these changes of words, construction and punctuation shows in a clear light the imperfection of the work, as it came from the hands of the "learned men" at Rheims.

But what becomes, in view of these changes, of the Papal argument in favor of their version, that it is fixed and unchangeable, while the versions of the Protestants are many and contradictory? And who will tell us by what authority these changes, that have been going steadily on for the last two hundred and fifty years, have been made? Has any council been called to act upon these revisions, sanction, and give them, *ex cathedra*, the seal of inspiration? Has any Pope approved them, and authorized their publication and distribution in their present form among the subjects of his holiness? If not, how does any Catholic know that he possesses the inspired word of God? The version which he holds in his hand differs very materially from the Rheimish, which it pretends to be on its title page: And the changes have brought it into nearer and nearer proximity to the Protestant version, which he esteems so lightly. Manifestly there was need enough for all these changes; and it is equally manifest that there is need of still further changes, to make it conform to the earliest manuscripts extant, the foundations of all our knowledge of divine things.

3. The translators have not accurately indicated the words they introduce which had no corresponding word in the original text.

Any translation from one tongue into another, will require the addition of some elements not found in the former, to make it conform to the genius of the latter. These the translators of the Protestant version have scrupulously preserved in italics. It is easy for the reader to see in every sentence what was added to make a smooth English rendering, and what was contained in the inspired originals. If any one thinks the translators erred, and have obscured the sense, he is at liberty to reject these italicised words, or to introduce others to make the sentence perfect, according to his judgment of the sense. As our version was translated directly from the original tongues, there is no possibility of being led far astray from the mind of God. On the other hand, the Douay version of the Old Testament being three removes from the original Hebrew, and the Rheimish version of the New being two removes from the original Greek, the translators, by neglecting very generally to mark the added words, have deprived the common reader of the means of knowing precisely what elements were in the Hebrew and Greek, and what were added in the process of the several translations.

4. A fourth objection to this version is, imperfect translations of the original Hebrew and Greek.

Whether the errors complained of first existed in the Septuagint or Vulgate, or were introduced by the Douay and Rheimish translators, it makes no difference. It was the business of these latter to have corrected the errors of the former by reference to the original manuscripts.

In Isaiah liii. 4, we read in the Douay :

“Surely he hath borne our infirmities and carried our sorrows. And we thought him as it were a leper, as one struck by God and afflicted.” The word here rendered “a leper,” is a participle, not a noun, in the original, and translated by Gese-nius “smitten.” No rendering could be more literal, or more in accordance with the facts. We have no evidence that Christ was supposed to have the leprosy. But the Jews did suppose that his sufferings and death were the result of ambi-

tious and blasphemous pretensions. That God in his providence had brought him to justice, and that he was literally "smitten, stricken of God."

This error reveals in a very clear light the impossibility of securing a reliable translation from any version that has come through several dialects. The Hebrew of this word is *שׁׁבֵד* "smitten." The LXX has *εἰσεσται πόνων*, "to be in distress," or "affliction." And the Vulgate *quasi leprosum*, "as leprous."

The error then lay back of the Douay translators. But this can not make their translation either correct or authoritative.

The ninth verse of the same chapter Alexander has termed "a curiosity": "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death," so it is rendered in the authorized version, referring to his crucifixion between two thieves, and burial in a rich man's tomb. The Douay, following the LXX and the Vulgate, renders it: "He shall give the ungodly for his burial, and the rich for his death;" a rendering equally removed from the original prophecy, and the facts of Christ's death and burial. Indeed it is difficult to extract from it any sense whatever.

Little better is the rendering of Jer. xi. 19, which in the authorized version is: "Let us destroy the tree with the fruit thereof." It is a figurative expression, denoting complete destruction. The Douay version renders it, "Let us put wood on his bread." Thomas Ward in his "Errata" quotes St. Hierom as interpreting it, "the cross upon the body of our Saviour." But no idea can be more fanciful. The LXX mistook the meaning of the verb *שׁׁבֵד*, to destroy, to ruin, and translated it by *εμβαλλω*. The Vulgate adopted *mitto*, and thus the idea of destruction was lost, which the connection imperatively required, as the reader of the passage will see.

The words of Ezekiel, vii. 17, "All knees shall be weak as water," which is a figure of great force, as applied to a terror-stricken people, is rendered by the senseless phrase, "all knees shall run with water."

Take the first verse of the first Psalm. "Blessed is the man who hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, nor stood in the way of sinners, nor sat in the chair of pestilence." What nonsense is made of this last clause! What a complete failure

The fourth verse of this Psalm is as faulty as the first: "Not so the wicked, not so: but like the dust which the wind driveth from the face of the earth."

The second "not so" is not in the Hebrew. It first appears in the Greek, was copied into the Vulgate and of course appeared in the Douay. The same is true of the last clause, "from the face of the earth." The Hebrew verb means simply "To drive asunder, disperse, scatter."

The word "dust" is a mistranslation. The Hebrew is *תְּאֵזֶב*, "chaff." This is its only definition. The Greek translated it by *χρωμα* "something scraped from the surface of anything." And the Vulgate by *pulvis*, whence the Douay "dust."

Take the earnest entreaty of the second Psalm: "Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little." Read this a second time and see how congruous are its parts, how appropriate the exhortation to those who had "set themselves against the Lord, and against his Anointed." There is evidence on the face of it that the translation is spirited and faithful. Read now the rendering, and mark the punctuation of the Douay. "Embrace discipline, lest at any time the Lord be angry, and you perish from the just way. When his wrath shall be kindled in a short time, blessed are all they that trust in him." What fear is there that any man will "perish from the just way"? And why is he especially "blessed" who trusts in God after his wrath has been kindled "a short time"? Every reader must feel that this is an

imperfect rendering of the entreaties of God, while the critical scholar will see that it has no warrant in the Hebrew text or punctuation. It appears in the LXX., was copied into the Vulgate and the English, with no reference, apparently, after the first translation, to the original Hebrew. No, for the Council of Trent had anathematized all who should go behind the Latin Vulgate.

Let us take a few illustrations from the New Testament. "My Father which gave them me," said Christ of his disciples, "is greater than all." Such is the rendering of John x. 29, in the authorized version. It is very difficult to see how a more literal translation of the original: *Ο πατήρ μου, ὃς ὀξύων μοι, μετανωπάντων ἔστι*, could be given. And yet the Rheimish translators have this false statement, which can by no possibility be extorted from the Greek, and which stands in no proper connection with the remainder of Christ's discourse: "That which my Father hath given me is greater than all."

Here again we come to the original sin of the version in question, a servile copying of error. For turning to the Vulgate we find, "Pater meus, quod dedit mihi, magis omnibus est."

How feeble is the rendering of Paul's words in Heb. iv. 16: "That we might find grace to help in time of need," "Find grace in seasonable aid."

How the meaning of the Greek *ἐπιτούσιον* is obscured by the uncouth word, "supersubstantial," in Matt. vi. 11, "Give us this day our supersubstantial bread." Donnegan in his Lexicon renders the word "sufficient for sustenance." Robinson, (Gr. Lex.) says, "While some translate 'bread for sustaining life,' others, adopting a different derivation, translate 'to-morrow's bread, bread for the coming day, e. g., daily bread.'"

The Rheimish translators attempt to justify their rendering by the following note:

"By this bread so called here according to the Latin word and the Greek, we ask not only all necessary sustenance of the body, but much more, all spiritual food, namely, the blessed sacrament itself, which is Christ, the true bread that came down from heaven, and the bread of life to us that eat his body. And therefore called here

supersubstantial; that is, the bread that passeth and excelleth all creatures."

And yet when the phrase occurs in Luke, xi. 3, they render the same word as in the Protestant version, "Our daily bread."

5. Obvious perversions and falsifications to favor the doctrines of the Catholic church.

It is not pleasant to be compelled to speak of false translations, but there are some instances in which the corrupt doctrines of the Papacy evidently lent their corruptions to this version. Heb. xi. 21, is most grossly perverted to favor the worship of images. It is as follows: "By faith, Jacob dying, blessed every one of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod." This is accompanied by the following note:

"The Apostle here follows the ancient Greek Bible of the seventy interpreters, which translates in this manner, Gen. xlvi. 31, and alleges this fact of Jacob, in paying a relative honor and veneration to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph, as to a figure of Christ's sceptre and kingdom, as an instance and argument of his faith. But some translators, who are no friends to this relative honor, have corrupted the text by translating it, 'He worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff,' as if this circumstance of leaning upon his staff were any argument of Jacob's faith, or worthy of being thus particularly taken notice of by the Holy Ghost."

The author of this note has most evidently mistaken the grammatical construction of the verse. The subject of it being Jacob, the concluding phrase, "his rod," or "staff," most naturally refers to a staff in the hand of Jacob, and not in the hand of Joseph.

But not only is the translation defective, but the note also is incorrect, when it asserts that such is the statement of the Septuagint. Neither the Greek of the Apostle, nor the Septuagint which he followed, no, nor the Hebrew of which it is a translation, says, "he adored the top of his rod." In all of them there is the preposition "upon," which the Douay suppresses. It is difficult to see how it could have been ignorantly done. The Greek of the passage in Hebrews, and of the Septuagint translation of Gen. xlvi. 31, do not differ by a letter. It is as fol-

lows: προσεκίνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄχρον τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ. The Hebrew has the preposition נִזְבֵּחַ corresponding with the Greek ἐπὶ. נִזְבֵּחַ שָׁמָר נִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה. There is no warrant then either in the Hebrew, the Septuagint translation, or Paul's quotation of it for the Douay version, or the note appended to it. The fact obviously was, he worshipped God upon the top of his own staff, not a staff in the hand of Joseph.

The word here rendered "adore," or "worship," both in the Hebrew and Greek, implies an act of prostration upon the ground, with the face to the earth; such was the custom of past ages. This Jacob being unable to do from his great age and infirmity, he bowed himself upon his staff, and worshipped Jehovah. Our version has very properly added in italics the word "leaning." "He worshipped, *leaning* upon the top of his staff." For to worship upon it can mean nothing other than resting or leaning upon it while worshipping, instead of prostrating himself upon the ground.

While on this subject, we must not forget to refer to an imperfect rendering of this passage in Genesis, in both King James' and the Douay versions. In the former it is rendered, "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." In the latter, "Israel adored God, turning to the bed's head."

This defective translation arose, doubtless on this wise. The Hebrew word has two significations: מִזְבֵּחַ "bed," and מִזְבֵּחַ "rod," or "staff," according to two different ways of pointing it. The radical letters are the same, the vowel points are different. The Septuagint translators, making their version, as they did, several centuries before the vowel points were adopted, and before the Hebrew had entirely fallen into disuse as a spoken language, translated the word by πάζδων, "a rod, wand, or staff." This rendering the Apostle Paul sanctioned, for he evidently understood the sentence in the light of that meaning. He copied the Septuagint *verbatim et literatim*.

When, however, the Hebrew was no longer spoken, and doubts arose respecting the powers of the radical letters, and the correct manner of pronouncing them, a system of vowel points was invented. "This was completed," says Nordheimer, "about the seventh century of the Christian era." By the authors of this system of points, the word in question was

understood to signify "bed," and was pointed accordingly. This sense of the word reappears in the Vulgate. *Adoravit Israel Deum, conversus ad lectuli caput;* and this gave form to the Douay. The same cause decided the translation in King James' version, which, as will be seen, is more literal than the former, "Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." Such seems to be the history of the discrepancy between Gen. xlvi. 31, and Heb. xi. 21, which is a quotation of it; a discrepancy greatly to be regretted, though leading to no such evil consequences as the false rendering of the latter text in the Douay.

The question will perhaps be asked, Which is the correct translation of the original word? Shall we follow the Septuagint translators, or the authors of the Hebrew vowel points? We must give the preference to the judgment of the Seventy for the following reasons: They made their translation while the Hebrew was to some extent a spoken language, and before the method of pronunciation was wholly lost. Their rendering is sanctioned by the Apostle Paul when writing under the guidance of the inspiring Spirit. He had before him at the time of making the quotation both the Hebrew and the Septuagint translation. He adopted the latter as a correct rendering. Besides, there is no evidence that Jacob was at that time sick, or upon a bed. It is said, indeed, in verse 29th, that "the time drew near that Israel must die." This fact occasioned the transaction under consideration. But in the verse following the one we have been examining, it is said: "After these things one told Joseph: Behold, thy father is sick;" implying that at the time of the transaction he was not sick. Furthermore, the Scriptures make no other reference to the head of a bed; nor had the bed in oriental countries, properly speaking, such an appendage. For these reasons, the rendering of the Septuagint is greatly to be preferred, and the translation of the word in Genesis must be regarded as defective, in both versions.

The tendency, which has been revealed in this passage to favor the worship of sacred things, most evidently corrupted the translation of Ps. xcix. 5: "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and adore his footstool, for it is holy." There is here a deliberate suppression of the Hebrew *ל*, before footstool, which in the authorized version is appropriately rendered, "at." "Worship at

his footstool." This last translation is sustained by the Greek which renders footstool in the dative case, and not in the accusative, $\tauῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ$. The phrase "worship at his footstool," is evidently a repetition of the thought in the first clause: "Exalt ye the Lord our God," the true object of worship being God, the second clause adding the place where that worship is to be rendered. Robinson in his Lexicon says: "προς with the dative marks a place or object by the side of which a person or thing is, by, at, near; as if in answer to the question, where?" Here the $\pi\rho\sigma$ in composition, $\pi\rho\sigma\pi\omega\tau\epsilon\tau$, seems to have this original force. The LXX also sanctions the authorized version of the last clause, $ὅτι ἄγιος ἐστε$: "For he is holy." The $\ddot{\alpha}\gammaιος$ can not refer to $\dot{\alpha}\gammaιος$ which is a neuter noun, but to the preceding $χρόνοι τῶν θεάν$. The error was first made in the Vulgate which is as follows: *adorate scabellum pedum ejus, quoniam sanctum est.*

Another passage, whose rendering in this version finds no warrant either in the Hebrew or the Septuagint is Ex. xxxiv. 29, the thought being repeated also in verses 30, 35.

"Moses knew not that his face was horned from the conversation of the Lord." The Hebrew of the phrase, "his face was horned," reads as follows: $וְיָמָר כִּי־בְּשָׂר כַּיְלָקָה$. This can admit of only one rendering: "The skin of his face emitted rays," or "shone." This it will be seen is the authorized version. The Greek version is similar: $ὅτι οὐκ ξαστατεῖ ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρώματος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ$. "The appearance of the skin of his countenance was glorified," or "made glorious." Hence Paul, when referring to the fact, says: "The children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory, [δόξα,] of his countenance."

If now we turn to the Vulgate we shall find the source of this defective translation. *Ignorabat quod cornuta esset facies sua*, "He knew not that his face was horned." The Douay has perpetuated this defective rendering, affording another proof of the principle laid down on a preceding page, that any version three removes from the original Hebrew can hardly fail to be burdened with errors.

Ward, in his labored *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, says:

"The English Protestants, on purpose to abolish the holy sacrifice of the mass, did not only take away the word altar out of the Scrip-

tures, but they also suppressed the name priest, in all their translations, turning it into elder; well knowing that these three, priest sacrifice and altar, are dependents and consequences one of another; so that they can not be separated. If there be an external sacrifice, there must be an external priesthood to offer it, and an altar to offer the same upon. So Christ, himself, being a priest, according to the order of Melchizedek, had a sacrifice, 'his body,' and an altar, 'his cross,' on which he offered it. And because he instituted this sacrifice, to continue in his church forever, in commemoration and representation of his death, therefore did he ordain his Apostles priests, at his last supper; where and when he instituted the holy order of priesthood or priests, saying, *hoc facite*, 'Do this,' to offer the self-same sacrifice in a mystical and unbloody manner, until the world's end."

The force of all this reasoning turns upon this last assumption, that Christ instituted the supper to be a sacrifice, and not rather to commemorate a sacrifice. Paul seems to have been oblivious of any such use of this sacrament, when he said, Rom. vi. 10, "In that he died, he died unto sin once for all"; *εφαπτα*, "once for all, once." (Donn. Lex.) So also in Heb. ix. 25, 26, 28; x. 10. "Nor yet that he should offer himself often," *πωλλάτις*, "many times, frequently." (Donn. Lex.) "Now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many. We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all," *εφαπτα*.

On Heb. ix. 25, we find this note in the Catholic Bible, lest the faithful should be led astray by the assertion, "Nor yet that he should offer himself often":

"Christ shall never more offer himself in sacrifice, in that violent, painful and bloody manner, nor can there be any occasion for it; since by that one sacrifice upon the cross he has furnished the full ransom, redemption and remedy for all the sins of the world." Very well said! Why not stop here and leave the impression just where the Apostle leaves it? But this would not answer. The note proceeds: "But this hinders not that he may offer himself daily in the sacred mysteries, in an unbloody manner, for the daily application of that one sacrifice of redemption to our souls." This clause conflicts direct-

ly with the former, and with the words and arguments of the epistle.

The Apostle Peter in his first epistle, iii. 18, affirms the same truth, making no reference to frequent sacrifices for sin : " Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."

Now if there is no sacrifice to be offered under this dispensation, there is no need of a priest, nor should we expect to find a constant reference to a priesthood, as under the old economy. But the Douay has uniformly rendered the Greek, *πρεσβύτερος*, "priest." For example, *Ae.* xiv. 23; xv. 2, and *Jas.* v. 14. "They ordained to them priests in every church." "They determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of the other side should go up to the Apostles and priests at Jerusalem." "Is any sick among you, let him bring in the priests of the church."

Now *πρεσβύτερος*, a comparative form, from *πρεσβύς*, which means a man between the ages of fifty two and sixty four, signifies primarily an older person; in the plural old men, seniors, aged. Such were called to take part in the management of civil and ecclesiastical affairs. To them was committed the management and government of individual churches. They were aged men, and because of their ordination were called the elders, or *πρεσβύτεροι*. But this term is nowhere applied to the priests of the old dispensation, to Christ as a spiritual high priest, or to Christians who are denominated priests unto God. Thus, *Mat.* xii. 5 : "The priests in the temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless." The reference here is to the Levitical priests, and the term *ἱερεύς* is used, as also in all other places in the New Testament, where a priest is referred to. If Christ is spoken of as the great high priest, it is *ἀρχιερέυς*, as in *Heb.* iv. 15; v. 1. If again he is referred to simply as a priest, without the prefix "high," the term used is *ἱερεύς*, as in *Heb.* v. 6, quoted from *Ps. cx.* 4, where the Septuagint has the same word. In like manner where the term is applied to Christians, as in *Rev.* i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6: "Priests unto God and his Father;" "Unto our God kings and priests;" "Priests of God and of Christ," the term *ἱερεύς* is uniformly found.

On what principle of correct interpretation could the Douay translators have proceeded, when they invariably rendered πρεσβύτερος by “priest”, making no distinction between this word and ἀρέπος? With the passing away of the Mosaic economy the term priest was dropped, and the officers of the Christian churches are denominated ὁ πρεσβύτερος, which can not be translated priests, but elders, as in our authorized version. Christ was the last priest on earth, his body the last atoning sacrifice, his cross the last altar.

We come now to what must be regarded as the worst defect of this version, the rendering of the words μετανοέω and μετανοια by “penance.” In the Romish church penance means “Suffering, labor or pain which a person voluntarily subjects himself to, or which is imposed on him by authority, as a punishment for his faults, or an expression of penitence; as fasting, flagellation, wearing chains, &c. It is one of the sacraments of the Catholic church.” (Webster.)

In Matt. iii. 2, John is represented as exhorting the people, as the burden of his message, to “Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” As this is the first instance of the use of the word μετανοέω, it is accompanied by the following note to justify the rendering: “This word, according to the use of the Scriptures, and the holy fathers, does not only signify repentance, and amendment of life, but also punishing past sins by fasting, and such like penitential exercises.”

Here is a virtual acknowledgment that “repentance and amendment of life” are the primary meaning of the word. Of course it ought to have governed the translation, unless there was something in the connection that modified its meaning. Besides, the authorities do not justify the rendering of the word do penance, or confirm the truthfulness of the note.

Donnegan’s Greek Lexicon says it means “To change one’s mind on subsequent reflection; to change one’s resolution, to repent or regret, to rue an action.” The corresponding noun is defined as “a change of mind or purpose on subsequent reflection or experience; repentance, regret.” Robinson’s Lexicon of the New Testament gives the same definitions essentially, but refers to some passages where the repentance was attended with “acts of external sorrow,

penance ;" as "Tyre and Sidon would have repented long ago sitting in saccloth and ashes."

But even here the repentance was an inward spiritual act. The penance is not designated by the word *μετανοέω*, but by the phrase sitting in "saccloth and ashes."

There is then no sufficient warrant for the translation, "do penance." This is a perversion of the great command, which looks only and entirely to a change in the subjective state of the sinner in respect to his sins, not at all to "acts of external sorrow." The rendering "do penance," turns the mind directly away from the spirit of the command. It leaves the sinner to cling to his sins, and think only of some outward infliction of suffering ; leaves him in impenitence, and under the wrath of God still.

This perversion of the most vital doctrine of the Gospel will help us to account for a strange feature of the Romish communion, that with all their religiousness, their conscientious performance of outward rites and ceremonies, they have nevertheless, very little conscience of sin. They can commit the most glaring acts of sin, as profanity, intemperance or Sabbath desecration, and yet feel no compunction, nor prejudice their standing in the church. The Scriptures, as they possess them, and hear them read and explained, deceive them respecting the method of salvation, holding the mind to bodily mortification, rather than godly sorrow. We may hope that by the Spirit's work in the heart, many go further than this, but we have little reason to expect renunciation of sin, when the commands of God respecting it are robbed of all their life, and can be satisfied with external acts of mortification.

It is not necessary to refer to all the passages where this false rendering is found. The following may serve as a specimen :

"I baptize you in water unto penance." "Jesus upbraided the cities wherein were done most of his miracles, because they had not done penance." "The disciples went and preached that men should do penance." "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that doth penance." "If thy brother sin against thee, reprove him, and if he do penance, forgive him." "Knowest thou not that the benignity of God leadeth thee to penance?" "The sorrow that is

according to God worketh penance." "The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should do penance."

How easily from such a version, the conscientious Catholic derives the doctrine that his salvation is sure if he performs the penances regular and occasional, laid upon him by his church! We can understand, in the light of this perversion of truth, what feelings actuated Luther, as on his knees he slowly and painfully ascended the steps of Pilate's stair-case at Rome. We can understand what are the feelings that actuate every Romanist, as he observes scrupulously the weekly and Lenten fasts appointed by his church. The last passage given above will explain it all. Mere penance will be relied upon to secure his salvation, whatever may be the state of the heart.

By a strange inconsistency, the rendering of the words *μετανοέω* and *μετάνοια* in a few instances is correct. "They glorified God, saying, then hath God also to the Gentiles given repentance unto life." Peter exclaims, "Be penitent, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." "Him hath God exalted to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins." Speaking of Jezebel, God says, "I gave her a time that she might do penance, and she will not repent of her fornications."

In the Greek the same verb is found in both these sentences, and they should most obviously have been both translated "repent." Nor is the rendering of the Douay justified by the Latin Vulgate: *ut paenitentiam ageret; et non vult panitere.* The phrase *ut paenitentiam ageret*, means simply "that she might repent," or "to repent." Ainsworth, in his Lexicon says, "The verb *ago* is often Englished by the verb of the following noun." And among other numerous illustrations, he gives "*agere paenitentiam*, to repent." So that there is no warrant even in the Vulgate where we have found so many errors, for the translation, "that she might do penance."

To these examples of gross perversions of the Scriptures, to favor the corrupt doctrines and practices of the Romish church, there should be added such translations as are not sustained by the best manuscripts.

In 2d Peter, i. 10, we read in our version: "Wherefore the rather brethren, give diligence to make your calling and elec-

tion sure;" a rendering perfectly literal of the Greek, *Ἄντιον πάλλου ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε βεβαιάν ὑμῶν τὴν πλήσιαν καὶ ἐπιοργὴν πυντίσθετε.*

The Rheimish version following the Vulgate, has the added phrase "by good works," *per bona opera.* This was not manufactured by the Rheimish doctors, it was not original with the Vulgate. The Syriac and a few Greek manuscripts contained it, though the weight of authority was against it. But it would be natural for a church that depends so much upon good works for justification, in distinction from justification by faith, to retain this passage, though the evidence of its genuineness was very slight.

Turning from this addition, we find in Rom. xi. 6, an important omission which subserves a similar purpose. Speaking of election as a matter of grace, Paul says, "If it be of works, then it is no more grace, otherwise work is no more work." This sentence is suppressed in the Romish version, on the authority of three mss., while the weight of evidence is decidedly in its favor. The tendency to a righteousness of works that retained the one, would suppress the other.

To these sectarian features of the Papal version of the Scriptures, there should be added a few more of the notes which always accompany this version. The Catholic clergy are always afraid of the Bible without note and comment. They circulate no editions of the word of God without accompanying them with their own interpretations.

In the words of Paul, "There is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus;" the note says; "Christ is the only mediator, who stands in need of no other to recommend his petitions to the Father. But this is not against our seeking the prayers and intercessions, as well of the faithful upon earth, as of the saints and angels in heaven." Here prayers to saints and angels are distinctly commended, though directly in the face of the text.

On the words of Paul describing those who "give heed to doctrines of devils, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats," we find the following note: "He speaks of the Gnostics, the Marcionites, the Encratites, the Manicheans, and other ancient heretics, who absolutely condemned marriage,

and all kind of meat; whereas, the church of God, so far from condemning marriage, holds it a holy sacrament, and forbids it to none but such as by vow have chosen the better part; and prohibits not the use of any meats whatsoever in proper times and seasons, though she does not judge all kinds of diet proper for days of fasting and penance."

But what right, we may ask, has the church to forbid marriage to any, when the Apostle Paul declares that "marriage is honorable in all;" and when the Apostle Peter himself, whom the Catholic regards as the stone upon which the church is built, had a wife! What right has it to forbid the use of meats, to make any fasts obligatory, under pains and penalties? The note is directly opposed to the text, and demanded only to save the institutions of the Catholic church. The judgment of Paul in such a case is, "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

It is not necessary to carry this investigation further. We have seen that the remoteness of the Douay version from the original Hebrew and Greek, must of necessity render it imperfect.

That the circumstances under which the translation was made were unfavorable to an elegant or faithful expression of the thoughts of God in our own vernacular is evident.

That it is encumbered with the Apocrypha, of whose inspiration we have no shadow of evidence, is a serious objection.

We have seen that in the progress of the translations from Hebrew to Greek, Greek to Latin, and Latin to English, no discrimination has been made between the words found in the originals, and those added to make the successive versions smooth and intelligible. The reader of the Douay translation has therefore no means of knowing what words have their synonyms in the ancient Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, and what have been brought in, in the process of translation.

We have shown, by a careful study of numerous passages, that the sense has often been lost by the causes enumerated above, and have pointed out the particular translation where the errors originated.

We have moreover found that numerous passages have been corrupted by defective and false translations, apparently to favor the errors of the Romish church, and that it is encumbered

with notes for the same object, which are not justified by the text, and which render the version intensely sectarian, as well as an imperfect expression of the mind and will of God.

We will only add, lest we should seem to have conducted this discussion in a censorious spirit, that with all its defects, speaking of it as a whole, the Catholic version should be regarded as the word of God. It is an expression of it sadly and needlessly imperfect, since better translations have been made into various languages, yet not so imperfect as when it came from the hands of its translators at Douay and at Rheims. The numerous changes it has undergone are improvements, though in particular passages, its doctrines are still obscured, or perverted to the advocacy of error. Still, considered as a whole, we should speak of it as the word of God, and should desire its circulation, rather than that individuals and communities have no Bible. Here are the great outlines of history, prophecy, and doctrine. Here the Ten Commandments unmarred, forbidding the worship of images, though perverted by a foot-note commanding images and pictures "even in the house of God, and in the very sanctuary" as "expressly authorized by the word of God." Still, here is the entire law standing over against these traditions of men. Rome has expunged the second commandment from her Breviaries and Manuals, making up the number by dividing the tenth. She has not dared to remove it from its place in the sacred word. Here is the history of the world for four thousand years, of which we have no other authentic record. Here are the prophets translated with tolerable accuracy, though filtered through the Greek and Latin tongues. Here are the life and teachings of Christ, in the great outline correct. Here is the record of his death, his resurrection and ascension to glory. Here too are the writings of his Apostles, and the glorious Apocalypse shown to the exile of Patmos.

It is to us a matter of interest that not less than forty five editions of the Douay have been published in this country: that recent editions have been so altered as to approximate more nearly to the original Hebrew and Greek; and that these latter are encumbered with the fewest notes.

The Turk, it is said, will not tread upon a piece of waste paper, without examining it, lest the divine name should be on it.

Let us show respect to the word of God, though in an imperfect translation, and strive to win the admiration even of the Papist, for our own incomparable version.

ARTICLE VII.

SHORT SERMONS.

"Samuel ministered before the Lord, being a child, girded with a linen ephod. Moreover, his mother made him a little coat, and brought it to him from year to year, when she came up with her husband, to offer the yearly sacrifice." *1 Sam.* ii. 18, 19.

Historical Introduction. We have here a simple, tender and instructive item of family history. (1) Devout parents, Elkanah and Hannah. (2) A consecrated child. (3) Of tender years, yet already in the temple ministering in holy things. (4) He is not forgotten at home, but talked of, prayed for, and often seen, though twenty-five miles away. (5) The annual visit to Shiloh and the sacrifice, with their devout preparation and anticipation. (6) The "little coat"; its material and preparation; the making; the talk of Elkanah and Hannah over it; every stitch is with prayer. (7) The going up to Shiloh and carrying it, and the conversation about the boy. (8) Samuel's childish anticipations of the visit and of the "little coat," and the counting of the days till it came. (9) The meeting and rejoicings. (10) The coat presented and examined, and talked over and delighted in. (11) He wears it about the temple, thinking who made it, while the parents watch their child.

So are the parents and the child bound together. So are Samuel's memories of home kept fresh and joyful and sacred.

Topic given by the text: The Need and the Uses of Memorial days and Holidays for children, with Gifts and Pleasures.

I. The Nature and Necessities of a child lay a foundation for these.

1. The necessities of a child for these are as real as those of manhood.
2. The desires of the child for enjoyment are as reasonable as those of manhood.
3. And they are as strong.

II. These natural Necessities of the child for enjoyment should be provided for.

1. Because they are a proper part of human nature, common to the child and adult, and gratified in the latter.

2. If pleasures are not provided for them, children will provide their own. For, nature is stronger than parental authority, or selfishness or indifference. It is better, therefore, to provide and so control them.

3. Their enjoyments should be made childlike, according to their nature, and capacity and desires. We too soon forget our own childhood. Paul remembered his: "When I was a child," etc. It is unnatural, unwise and unkind to try to lift prematurely a child out of childhood; a child pushed up into "a little man," "a little lady," is a repulsive sight.

The advice of Sir Thomas Browne to adults may be profitably remembered and used by them when dealing with children: "Confound not the distinctions of thy life which nature hath divided; that is, youth, adolescence, manhood and old age; nor in these divided periods, wherein thou art in a manner four, conceive thyself but one. Let every division be happy in its proper virtues. . . . Do as a child but when thou art a child, and ride not a reed at twenty." But we must give the child his hobby-horse, even as we have ours, Bonner-like, a more costly and faster, though perhaps not less foolish "reed."

III. Anniversary Days and Gifts are highly useful in the proper training of a child.

1. Anticipation of them does the child good. How joyfully Samuel anticipated the visit and "little coat"!

Such concentration of joys into set days and occasions makes a cheerful character and sunny life for the child. A year without an anniversary day or gift for a child is a serious thing.

2. The mutual giving of gifts breaks up selfishness, binds a family together, and the children to their home. So Christmas and New Years, birth days, etc., are of immense value in a family.

3. It is wise to connect the gift with occasions: as the first Bible on some birth day, the skates at Christmas, etc. Those gift days become a power over the child. The cost, the time, or the trouble is but little to the parent, but the remembrance by some token is much to Samuel, "being a child." A friend writes us thus:

"D——, Dec. 18, 1865.

" . . . The children are full of buying Christmas presents. Alice is making a portfolio to be filled with original drawings by herself from *Pickwick*, for her father. They are really very good and have taken

much time. The boys have purchased a China cup and saucer for father. They have likewise had numerous discussions about buying mother's presents. I can guess just what they have all bought me, but of course know nothing, see nothing, and have no idea of what is going on. They have all bought each other gifts, which I have secreted safely."

How much such a family has of love and joy within itself. What attachment to home; and so their sports and games and toys are kept within the safe circle of home.

Who can tell how much the annual "little coat" had to do in making the pious boy, the noble youth, and the most noble man, Samuel? View this boy when a man, late in life, "old and gray-headed": "I have walked before you from my childhood unto this day. Whose ox have I taken? Or whose ass have I taken? Or whom have I defrauded? Whom have I oppressed? Or of whose hand have I received any bribe? And I will restore it unto you. And they said: Thou hast not defrauded us, nor oppressed us, neither hast thou taken aught of any man's hand." A good return, such a man, for "a little coat."

REFLECTIONS.

1. Juvenile crime increases, truancy, stubbornness before parents, rowdyism, theft and worthlessness.
2. What is our remedy? Restore the family to its proper place, and functions, as the place of full obedience, of the highest joys, and most tender memories. To this end there must be memorial days when Samuel can put on his "little coat," and Hannah and Elkanah rejoice with him.

"He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul."—*Prov.* viii. 36.

THE infinite and eternal Wisdom, the omnipotent Word, who was before the beginning of creation, and by whom the worlds were made, here speaks to men, saying: "He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul."

(a.) All sin committed by men is against God. Sin is a transgression of his holy law. Our neighbor may suffer wrong at our hands, but he is only the medium through which a blow is aimed at the moral government of the supreme lawgiver. Every true penitent becomes sensible of this, as was David, when in view of the twofold wrong he had committed against one of his subjects. In the deep consciousness of his guilt, he confessed his sin, saying:

"Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight." Uriah was atrociously wronged, and finally slain. David was the guilty man. The sin was against God.

(b.) Although all sin committed by men is aimed directly or indirectly against God, there is a vast force in the recoil thereof, which comes back upon the sinner. Sin is directed against God from human wills and arms of flesh, and is turned back upon the sinner in conscious guilt and unending penalties; so the transgressor can not contend unharmed with an omnipotent arm and the force of divine justice.

(c.) In sinning against God the sinner himself is the greatest sufferer. God is not essentially injured by any thing which men can do, however great their sins may be, but the sinner wrongs himself. This idea of self-inflicted wrong is a truly startling one. It would seem that self-interest ought to ensure us against such an outrage inflicted on ourselves. We do not act thus in our temporal affairs. We may cheat and defraud our fellow-men, but generally keep a sharp lookout that no harm comes to ourselves. Surely there is an unfathomable depth of depravity in the human heart.

(d.) If men by sinning against God should injure themselves in health, property, or reputation, and deprive themselves of happiness in this life merely, as they often do when under the power of sensual vices, as if the recoil of sin were a mere temporal matter, then men might venture to risk the consequences; but in sinning, the soul is wronged, ruined for time and eternity. It is a radical, everlasting wrong.

How blind to their own eternal welfare, and how infatuated do men become when acting under the power of depraved natures.

Beware of the self-inflicted wrong of sinning against God.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY NOTICES.

1.—*Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.* By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D. D., Baldwin Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

WE entertain a very high opinion of Professor Shedd as an author. Whatever he sends forth is scholarly, elegant, rich in thought

and illustration, and fitted to subserve high ends in the church and in the republic of letters. The present volume answers fully this description, in every point. We doubt if any one of his works surpasses it in value. It discusses topics of vital importance always, and of special interest at the present time, when the question is being deeply and sorrowfully pondered by good and thoughtful men in our own country and in England: How shall the pulpit regain the power with the masses which it has lost to a fearful extent, and is losing more and more every day? This volume of Professor Shedd is an important contribution to the solution of the question. Every young minister and every theological student should obtain it without delay. That he will read it with deep interest, from the beginning to the end, is, we think, as certain as that he has any adequate idea of the greatness and difficulty of his work.

The part of the volume devoted to Homiletics comprises twelve chapters. The first, on the "Relation of sacred eloquence to Ritual Exegesis," is a masterly argument for the exegetical study of the Bible as lying at the foundation of all true and lofty pulpit oratory. "The duty and function of the theologian is most certainly that of an interpreter, and that alone." This point he beautifully illustrates by reference to natural science, and shows that the great law of investigation is in both cases precisely the same. "The attitude, therefore, of the human mind toward revelation should be precisely the same as toward nature. The naturalist does not attempt to mould the mountains to his patterns; and the theologian must not strive to prefigure the Scriptures to his own private opinions." "The author insists mainly on two "oratorical influences," as proceeding from a thorough exegetical acquaintance with the Scriptures, which are, *originality* and *authority*. How the quality of originality has been exhibited in the men who have been lifelong and humble students of the inspired Word, imparting a mighty power to their preaching, he shows by reference to the great pulpit orators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: Hooker, Howe, Taylor, South, Barrow, Bates, in striking contrast with the "smooth common-places" of Alison and Blair in the century following, making clear to a demonstration his point that the Christian Scriptures "are the great and transcendent source of originality and power for the human intellect." Having treated the other point with equal force and beauty of argument and illustration, he concludes: "He, then, whose public discourse is pervaded with the spirit of revelation, and who speaks as the oracles of God, will be eloquent in the highest style."

In discussing the nature of Homiletics, the Professor describes a

sermon as the most difficult of orations, because intended to influence the whole nature of man ; and the difficulty is greater now, he affirms, than fifty years ago, because men are more vivid in their thinking, and impatient of prolixity.

The chapter on style is of exceeding value, and is, in itself, a fine illustration of the leading qualities, which he indicates ; that it be intelligible, "not only clear like the light, but round like the sun."

We would like to present Professor Shedd's rules for sermonizing, both general and special ; but our limits forbid. On "Species of sermons," he clears away a large amount of rubbish which has, for many years past, caused no little embarrassment to young preachers who have tried to go by rule. He finds only three, Topical, Textual, Expository. Passing the chapters on the choice of a text, and the plan of a sermon, we come to a topic which is exciting more than usual attention at the present day, Extemporaneous Preaching. This is treated with much breadth and with masterly skill, and for every young preacher certainly, the chapter is worth many times the price of the volume.

In treating "The Matter and Manner of Preaching," the author insists that the constant aim should be to be evangelical, and that the preacher should be willing to leave many books unread that he may be thoroughly acquainted with the Bible. In the chapter on Preacher and Hearer, are some striking and valuable thoughts on the duty of auditors to the preacher. "Eloquence, in its highest forms and efforts," he says, "is a joint product of two factors : of an eloquent speaker, and an eloquent hearer."

Under Liturgical Cultivation, are included reading of the Scriptures, selection of hymns, and prayer.

The concluding one-fourth of the volume is devoted to Pastoral Theology, and is divided into six chapters on the following topics: Definition of Pastoral Theology ; Religious Habits of the Clergyman ; Intellectual Character and Habits of the Clergyman ; Social and Professional Character of the Clergyman ; Pastoral Visiting ; Catechising.

Our readers, many of them, will have perceived that these essays are not new. Most of them have appeared in other forms. In a brief "Prefatory Note," Prof. Shedd says :

"Most of the materials of this treatise were originally composed in the form of lectures, in the years 1852 and 1853, when the author held the Professorship of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Theology in Auburn Theological Seminary. Upon entering on other lines of study and instruction, they were thrown aside. Several of them within the past two years have appeared in the *American Theological*

Review, and the interest which they seemed to awaken, has led to the revision of the whole series, and to their combination (with two or three other essays upon kindred topics), into the form of a book. Although constructed in this manner, the author believes that one 'increasing purpose' runs through the volume, and hopes that it may serve to promote, what is now the great need of the church, a masculine and vigorous rhetoric, wedded with an earnest and active pastoral zeal."

2.—*The Household of Sir Thomas More.* By the author of "Mary Powell." New edition, with an appendix. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1867.

ANOTHER charming book in the new and happy vein of the writer. We hardly see the pleasant device of the modern antique, so well is the ancient dust made to order and laid on. It is not so easy to gain so intimate and accurate a view of the every day life and times of Sir Thomas in any other way, as in this little volume. The leading facts in his great life are woven in most naturally, and you lay down the book feeling that you have been spending a few days yourself at Chelsea. The simple narration throws, if it were possible, a deeper shade over the dark name of Henry VIII. The appendix is a happy and profitable afterthought in this edition.

3.—*Wool-Gathering.* By GAIL HAMILTON. Author of etc., etc. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

A CHATTY, rollicking, capering, episodical, scathing, self-satisfied, readable, bewitching book. Nothing in it that you have not seen, felt and talked of, if you have been on the cars to Albany, Buffalo, and Chicago, on the steamer of any Western river, and on a prairie and a Western farm, and an old Virginia plantation. But Miss Gail tells it all so easily and prettily, that you delight to have it said over again, and specially delight to have her do it. You wonder that any one should take the labor and pains to put so many little, way-side, every-day, and most common-place items on paper and type, and a counter, but you are glad that she has done it, particularly when you feel that in doing it no domestic duties were neglected. The book is a delightful trifle, and reminds us of those exquisite paintings of a hen and chickens. Everybody is familiar with the scene, but very few can paint it.

We presume the authoress went to Minnesota alone, so the book impresses us; nor does the journey indicate the lack of a cicerone. She is sufficient; indeed our compassion rather is stirred a little for some of the barbaric officials on the road. This easy pen has a facile

aptness in expressing feelings as well as views. Witness the parting benison when our gentle authoress takes her tiny foot off the steamer.

"Good bye, Damsel. May you sink a thousand fathoms deep, or ever I set foot on your horrid deck again! May forty snags crush your timbers, and drag you down into the turbid depths! May you blow up with kerosene when no passengers are on board!—as to officers and crew I make no stipulations. May you run aground and stick fast, and snap every pole that you try to push off with! May you be overthrown by wild winds on the eastern shores of Lake Pepin, and never heard of more! May every raft butt you, and every big steamer run you down, and every little steamer outstrip you! May water drown you, and fire burn you, and your sky rain thick disasters, till you cease to be a pestilent speck on the bosom of the River of Greatness." p. 74. There! Who says women ought not to vote, make speeches and laws, and be chairmen of Congressional Committees on railroads, steam navigation, and natural comforts generally.

We have enjoyed this book, and the more so because it is not anonymous.

4.—*Expository Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians.* By the Rev. ROBERT MCGHEE, A. M., M. R. I. A., etc., Dublin. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

WE regard this course of Fifty Two Lectures as an admirable specimen of expository preaching. It is historical, biographical, geographical, exegetical, argumentative and practical. There is a good use of biblical scholarship, without any peculiar show of it. The lectures are totally free from philological and extremely critical exposition, so common and legitimate in the professional commentator. While Mr. McGhee follows closely the text, he enriches his discourses by an inflowing from the other Scriptures, so making them more like topical discussions. The personal and direct uses, to which he puts the truths of the Epistle, give life and earnestness to the expositions. Here he has escaped the evil of dulness, the common bane of expository preaching, and given us reading for devotion as well as instruction. It is true the Lectures assume a large measure of intelligence on religious truth in his audience. This the preacher can always assume, if he will stick fast to the revealed religion of the Gospel or Epistles, and let philosophies, metaphysics, and school-isms alone.

We can not but think it would be better for the American pulpits

and audiences if ministers would substitute more of this kind of preaching, so common in Great Britain and on the Continent, for our classic essays, falsely called finished sermons.

5.—*Lectures on Christian Theology.* By ENOCH POND, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Bangor. Congregational Board of Publication. 1867.

THIS is a new edition with a full index. The work itself has been already favorably noticed in these columns. We can only add that the index increases the value of the treatise, stating also our satisfaction at learning that the venerable Professor has prepared a question book to accompany it, more especially for the use of Bible classes. Let him also make a smaller treatise for the same use.

6.—*The Theology of the Greek Poets.* By Rev. W. S. TYLER, Williston Professor of Greek in Amherst College. Boston: Draper & Halliday. 1867.

THE several chapters of this learned and solid book have already appeared in the *Biblical Repository* and *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and the *Theological Review*, and have probably been read by most of our clerical subscribers. They will be glad to have them in this single volume, and will be justly grateful for the literary, scholarly and Christian labor of the author.

7.—*First Historical Transformations of Christianity.* From the French of Athanase Coquerel, the Younger. By E. P. EVANS, Ph. D., Prof., etc., Ann Arbor, Michigan. Boston: Wm. V. Spencer. 1867.

WE think the University of Michigan might find better employment for its Professor than the translation of this volume and others, in advocacy of rationalism, which have lately come from his pen. Athanase Coquerel, Jr., is a leader in the advanced or infidel wing of Unitarianism. This book treats of religion as a development, taking on new modifications with the progress of the ages. Its author discusses successively the Christianity of Jesus Christ, Judaical Christianity, Hellenistic Christianity, The Christianity of St. Paul, St. Peter, St. John, Roman Christianity, The Christianity of the First Fathers, and the First Heretics. A specious book.

8.—*Chemistry of the Farm and the Sea. With other Familiar Essays.* By J. R. NICHOLS, M. D., Editor of the Boston Journal of Chemistry, etc., etc.

NINE Essays, eminently practical, and thoroughly scientific,

written in a language for the common reader. "Chemistry of the Sea," "of the Farm," "of a Bowl of Milk," "of the Dwelling," "of a Kernel of Corn," "of the Sun," on "Obscure Sources of Disease," "Local Decomposition in Lead Aqueduct Pipes," and on "Bread and Bread-making." There is a rare amount of common sense and uncommon information in these papers, and they happily illustrate the fact, that what is useful in science can be made clear to the popular mind by a man who understands his subject. It is the imperfect master who speaks obscurely in practical science.

9.—*Jaques Bonneval, or the Days of the Dragonnades.* By the author of "Mary Powell," etc. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1867.

THIS story opens in the year 1685, made forever memorable and horrid in the bloody calendar of Rome Papal, by the revocation of the Edict of Nantz. In the graceful and natural style of this fascinating writer, we are passed through one of those terrible scenes of Roman Catholic persecution, that so stain and blot the history of Christendom. He who begins the book will finish it, and he will never forget it. We hope we are a little nearer the millennium than the times here so graphically and truthfully portrayed.

10.—*Sermons by the late Alexander McClelland, D. D.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

THESE seventeen sermons will recall a good man to the memory of many, and they will love to read and own what they were once delighted to hear from his lips.

The style is simple, the doctrines evangelical, and the connecting thoughts mighty. The discourses have just the least possible of that flippancy which gains for the pulpit a noisy and short popularity.

11.—*The Bulls and the Jonathans; comprising John Bull and Brother Jonathan, and John Bull in America.* By JAMES K. PAULDING. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

THIS volume of satire grew out of the disturbed relations between the United States and Great Britain, that culminated in the war of 1812. It is full of uncomfortable facts, keenly set in chapters, and scathingly and jocularly turned back on our step-mother, Britannia. The key to the music of the book is struck in the first sentence: "John Bull was a choleric old fellow, who held a good manor in the middle of a great mill-pond."

It is lively reading, and the reprint reads the more oddly, after half a century, when Jonathan has become a little taller than John.

12.—*Kathrina; Her Life and Mine, in a Poem.* By J. G. HOLLAND, author of "Bitter Sweet." New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

THIS new Poem of Dr. Holland, though in dramatic power and varied interest it may not be equal to "Bitter Sweet," is yet a very beautiful production. To some passages we take exceptions. For example, to the mulierolatry of the following on the 8th page :

" If God be in the sky and sea,
And live in light and ride the storm,
Then God is God, although He be
Enshrined within a woman's form:
And claims glad reverence from me.

" So as I worship Him in Christ,
And in the forms of earth and air,
I worship Him imparadised,
And throned within her bosom fair
Whom vanity hath not enticed."

The author must have confused ideas as to how God is in Christ. He seems to be a pantheist. A little more exactness of statement might be expected even in a poem, from an author who has ventured to discuss such a subject as The Origin of Evil in "Bitter Sweet." From another passage, later in the volume, it seems that Kathrina once attempted to teach the author better theology.

Here is one of the finest passages in the volume. It depicts a very common, but very impressive scene.

" It was Communion Day.
The simple table underneath the desk
Was draped with linen, on whose snow was spread
The feast of love—the vases filled with wine,
The separated bread and circling cups.
The venerable pastor had come down
From his high pulpit, and assumed the seat
Of presidence, and, with benignant eyes,
Sat smiling on his flock. The deacons all
Rose from their pews—four old brown-handed men,
With frosty hair—and took the ancient chairs
That flanked the table. All the house was still
Save here and there the rustle of a silk
Or folding of a fan; and over all
Presided the dove of peace. I had no part
In the fair spectacle, but I could feel
That it was beautiful and sweet as heaven."

It is rather hard, however, to believe that "Paul" was really drawn into that church in Hadley by the charm of Kathrina's voice. But,

seeing he was a poet and a singer too, perhaps he was. We give him the benefit of the doubt.

We believe in Dr. Holland. He is true to his moral instincts and noble in his aims; but in theology he makes out about as well as Henry Ward Beecher, once his pastor, to whom he dedicates his "Titcomb Letters." To our mind, such a writer outweighs a hundred-fold such men as make ridicule of serious things the grand aim of their literary efforts, though he does make an occasional slip in theology.

ARTICLE IX.

THE ROUND TABLE.

A NEW LAW. "That is a bad religion which makes us hate the religion of other people." So says *The Advance*. The author appears to be that "mother of invention" whose sententious wisdom is so often required to fill out a newspaper column, and who sometimes speaks aphoristically without due reflection. Maxims are mighty things, chapters condensed into few words, or else brief statements latent with possible chapters. They are quickly read, and their terseness and point cause them to stick in the memory. They are often adopted as articles of faith, and rules of action. They are "aids to reflection" not only, but aids to wit and speech and influence. Hence the importance of their moral quality. If true, they are universally applicable, and potent for good. If totally false, they are never applicable; but though often applied, their potency for evil is limited by their palpable falseness. If half true, they are applicable only within certain limitations; but since the true in their mixed quality is but the sugar coating of the false, they are apt to gain a currency for truth, and a power for harm, otherwise impossible.

The maxim above quoted has a very charitable sound. There is a show of brotherly love in the echo. It seems to be the utterance of a heart ready to take into its friendship and fellowship the advocates and devotees of every religion, except those who "hate the religion of other people." But here is a dilemma. For dame Necessity evidently deems her own religion good, and condemns as bad the religion of all who hate it; while, according to her maxim, her own religion is bad because it makes her hate theirs. If no religion is good which makes us hate a bad one, then the bad is lovely and the lovely is not good. The distinction between a good and a bad

religion is thus annihilated, and Christianity is reduced to a level with every form of the religion of antichrist. The charitableness of the maxim is a little too far advanced.

Within certain limitations the saying is true enough. There are many religions that make men hate the religion of others. There is but one true religion, and that is Christianity ; and against this all false religions are essentially in league. Judaism, Mohammedanism, Romanism, Unitarianism, Universalism, Mormonism ; these, beyond question, make their respective adherents hate evangelical religion, and are therefore bad. Indeed every false religion is apt to hate every other false religion as well as the true one. If there be any two false religions between which there is not mutual hatred, it is because their respective adherents fail to discern any radical difference between them, and differ only by accident of position or of taste. Possibly Unitarianism and Universalism are examples of such mutual toleration.

Beyond these and similar limitations, however, the saying is false. Christianity in all its essentials differs from all false religions in being supernatural and divine. Between two Christians as such there can be no radical difference, because they all accept "Jesus Christ and him crucified," as the only ground of human salvation. Therefore, though they may be known by different names, according to their preferences in things left to human judgment and taste, no denomination of Christians can hate another. But Christianity, under all its denominational names, is opposed to every false religion and teaches us to hate every religion as false which does not rest on Jesus Christ as the Godman, delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed ; for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." According to John, then, not to hate antichrist is to fellowship him and bid him God speed. And Jesus Christ, who spake by John in exile, declared that he hated the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, and commended the church of Ephesus for hating it. The Psalmist wrote, "Through thy precepts I get understanding : therefore I hate every false way." Christians are not worthy the name who do not thus sympathise with Christ, and with all true members of his church in hating every false religion. Christianity, because it is the true and the only good religion, makes us hate every other so-called religion as false and bad. The good and true religion makes good men, while a bad religion makes those who espouse it worse than they were before. That is not Christian charity which does not hate a false religion ; a false religion is bad because sinful, and therefore

God and good men hate it. Christianity teaches us to love our neighbors as ourselves, but it does not teach us to love their false religions. As God hates sin and loves the sinner with such compassion as to offer him salvation by grace, so Christians should hate all false religions, but pity and pray for, and labor to save the victims of them.

The maxim belongs to the category of the half-true. It is just as true and just as false as if it read, "That is a bad religion which does not make us hate the religion of other people;" or as if it read, "That is a good religion which makes us hate the religion of other people." Neither is wholly true, or wholly false; but either, if adopted, would have a pernicious influence. It is a positive injury to the deluded to treat their delusions as not to be hated. It is the glory of Christianity that it will neither tolerate nor be charitable towards antichrist, while in forbearance, meekness and love, it endeavors to reclaim the victims of antichrist.

POPISH PRETENTIONS NOT ABATED. There certainly has been an improvement in some of the fashions of papal Rome since the days when Montaigne found the pope and cardinals drinking the sacramental wine from the chalice, with "an instrument" contrived "to provide against poison"; and saw at the mass "the pope, the cardinals, and other prelates . . . seated during nearly the whole mass, with their caps on, talking and chatting together." The civilization of the Vatican is better than then; but its Christianity, not a whit.

Indeed, we are almost inclined to withdraw the concession just made, as to any essential improvement in the civilization of the papacy, when we find the same intolerant bigotry ruling its counsels as in the sixteenth century. What sort of a thing is a civilized spirit of persecution which can to-day defend the Roman Inquisition as a justifiable religious and civic institution? But this is done unblushingly by popish apologists. The late affair of the interdict of Protestant worship at Rome has brought out several staunch maintainers of the duty of the pontiff of that city thus to resist such a movement of the "gigantic rebellion against the church of God," as Protestantism is called. "Why," asks one of those champions of antichrist, himself the son of an American Episcopal bishop, "why should a congregation, rebellious in a religious point of view, be allowed within the walls of Rome?" that one spot on earth, "where error," says this pervert, "has never been permitted to have a foothold"! Rome "claims the earth for an inheritance," adds our pamph-

leteer, into which "Protestantism is everywhere the intruder." Of course, this intruder is to be whipped out of the earth, wherever it appears, if the old toothless giant has force enough at command to do it. It may be done at Rome, perhaps; but hardly in this region quite yet. Wherever it is possible, Rome claims such hunting-grounds for her inquisitorial hounds as arrogantly as ever, only these must not bark too loudly. To deny this is to charge her with what she would resent as an unpardonable insult—a repudiation of her once avowed policy. For is not the Roman church infallible? And can the infallible ever contradict itself? Rome must be a persecuting hierarchy so long as she is Rome ecclesiastically, whether that Rome be in Italy or in America. If her sword is here sheathed, it is simply and only because the attempt to draw it would endanger her own head: and this she is not ready yet to offer upon the altar of martyrdom.

In our opinion, these things are pretty generally understood by our people. We do not believe that much faith is put in papal pretences to love of popular liberty among us, except such liberty as now and then breaks out in a rough and tumble riot in New York and elsewhere, in the interests of this mediaeval concentration of ignorance and superstition. But too much faith is put in the supposed impossibility of Rome's ever becoming really dangerous to our national welfare. She knows this, and plays upon our credulity with great skill. We have sometimes almost wished that she would forget herself, and adventure some genuine piece of ultramontane churchcraft upon us, if sooner too self-confident and secure lovers of liberty might get a galvanic shock which should show them, once for all, what a thorough foe of freedom we are sheltering in our bosom. The history of our war, which some thought would disprove these perils, or remove them, has really done nothing in that direction, whatever exceptional instances of a true loyalty to free institutions may be on record. The sympathy of the priesthood, from His Holiness down, with the rebellion, is the proper and the certain gauge of that matter. Rome, in this country, is what and where she always has been, and always must be, till her race is run, and "Babylon is fallen!" is written over her utter desolation. But before that comes, she expects to add the negro vote to the Irish and by this union of races at the ballot-box in her behalf, to replace for a long term of power on this continent, the loss of the pope's temporal dominion abroad. Said a Jesuit, the other day, to a friend of ours: "The ballot here will more than compensate us, in a few years, for our losses at Rome."

ACADEMIC HONORS. Since our last issue, two more of our editorial corps have been put upon the retired list and garnered into the class of most reverend D. D.'s. A strange fatality attends the publicity which an editorial position imposes ; and so fast has the number of our untitled ones decreased within the two years past, that we are compelled to adopt the language of Job's servants, fresh from the scenes of his accumulated catastrophes : "And we alone are escaped to tell thee !" Should the same fatality continue, thus removing from the remaining editors all motive to exertion, we suppose the *Review* must cease to be. *Quod avertant dii !*

ECCE HOMO.

Tell me where I can behold Him,
Him, the God in human form ;
Can my arms of love enfold Him,
Will he hear my accents warm ?

Lo the Man ! on cross uplifted,
Lo the Man ! with thorn-set crown ;
Side with cruel spear-thrust rifted,
Head in anguish hanging down :

Hands outstretched, with nails thrust through them,
Breathing forth his human life ;
Hark, what accents ! listen to them,
Catch his agony and strife.

It is finished ! this oblation
That the prophets had foretold ;
It is finished ! this creation
Of the new man from the old.

Here I see earth's greatest wonder,
Here I see Time's ripest fruit ;
God in man, man's burdens under,
God in man, to man makes suit.

Ecce Homo ! O ye nations,
See His cross uplifted high ;
Neath its shadow take your stations,
Look to Him and never die !

BAPTISMS PECULIAR, IF BY IMMERSION. Mr. Dale, in his Classic *Baptism*, noticed by us in the July Number of the *Review*, gives some very singular cases of "immersion," as the Greeks used the word baptize. We quote a few of them from the forty or fifty authors, whom he cites.

Baptizes, [*βαπτίζει*] the breathing of the intellect. *Achilles Tat.* iv, 10.

The soul being baptized [*βεβαπτισμένην*] very much by the body. *Alex. Aphrod.* i, 38.

Many inclosed by the river perish, being baptized. *Diod. Sic.* i, 36.

Dip, *βάπτω*, that word of stumbling over which our Baptist brethren fall into deep water, means to put an object into a fluid, (when a fluid is implied,) for a very brief time. Brief continuance in the fluid is one of its strong and radically distinctive marks, as different from *βαπτίζω*. Its continuance is momentary. But *βαπτίζω* means continuance without limitation. The classic import of *βαπτίζω* makes no provision for taking its subject out of the water, when water is the element that is made to surround it. Very many cases, like the last quoted, show this. So but for borrowing the meaning of *βάπτω*, dip, a word foreign to baptism, the immersionists would leave all their subjects in the water. Their theory is built on *βάπτω*, which, unfortunately for them, is not the scriptural word.

Carrying down many, baptized them. [*εβάπτιζε*] [drowned them.] *Diod. Sic.* xvi, 80.

Baptizing killed him. *Aesop, Ape and Dolphin.*

One saved in the voyage, whom it were better to baptize, (drown.) *Themistius, Orat.* iv.

Baptized by the passion, [*βαπτίζόμενος ὥπο τῆς ἐπιθυμίας*] the noble man attempted to resist. *Chariton Aphrod.* ii, 4.

But Dionysius was baptized as to his soul. *Do.* iii, 2.

To be baptized by such a multitude of evils. *Achilles Tatius.*

Baptized by anger. [*τῷ θυμῷ*] *Do.*

Misfortunes befalling baptize us, [*βαπτίζονται ἡμᾶς*.] *Do.*

They do not baptize the people by taxes. *Diod. Sicul.* i, 73.

Baptized by the calamity. *Heliodorus Eth.* ii, 3.

The events still baptized you. *Do.* v, 16.

Grief baptizing the soul and darkening the judgment. *Libanius Emp. Jul.* 148.

Baptized either by diseases or by arts of the wizards. *Plotinus Enn.* 1, 4, 9.

We, baptized by the affairs of life. *Plutarch, Soc.*

Baptized by debts of fifty millions. *Plutarch, Galba.* xxi.

Baptized by unmixed wine. *Athenaeus, Phil. Bang.* v, 64.

Having baptized Alexander by much wine. *Conon; Narrat., L.*
Baptizing out of great jars of wine, drank to one another. *Plu-*
tarch, Alex., lvii.

Crippled and baptized by yesterday's debauch. *Plutarch, Water*
and Land Anim., xxiii.

This allusion to wine, and others to opiates and poisons, as the element for "baptisms," as also those "baptisms" by anger, grief, evils, etc., shows us the "mode," if baptism can be said to have any mode. Certainly the subject could not have been "immersed" in the various elements here mentioned. Baptism is simply a thorough change of the condition or state of the subject. Therefore a drop of poison, an event, a bottle of wine, the river Jordan or a tea-spoonful of it, a burst of passion, a debauch, a sluggish body, a misfortune, heavy tax-bills, a fever, or the common affairs of life, may baptize one. Anything can do it that thoroughly changes the character, state or condition of the person, be it a tide of evils or one of them, the Atlantic Ocean or a drop of it.

WANT OF ROOM compels us to hold over to our next Number many Book Notices prepared; and several books were received too late for examination.

INDEX.

A.

Academic Honors, 634.
Acts of the Apostles in Lange, noticed, 130.
Agassiz, Prof.; Geological Sketches, noticed, 143.
American Art, 158.
Anchored, 150.
Andrews, the Rev. W. W., article by, 621.
Annual of Scientific Discovery, by S. Knobland, noticed, 461.
Anointing Thee, with prayer, that saves the sick; article on, 115.
Apocrypha, and its origin and character, 591.
Atlantic Monthly, the theological animus of, article on, 214, 410.
Atwater, Prof. Lyman H.; Manual of Elementary Logic, noticed, 309.

B.

Baker, The Rev. A. A., article by, 40.
Bancroft's United States, vol. IX, noticed, 124.
Barrett, Mary; Steps in the Upward Way, noticed, 306.
Baptism, Classic, by the Rev. J. W. Dale, noticed, 463.
Baptism, Household, origin of, 502.
Baptism, Jewish, in the times of our Lord, as related to Household Baptism, article on, 502.
Baptism of John, what, 502.
Baptisms, Peculiar, if by immersion, 634.
Baptist Quarterly, noticed, 301.
Barrows, the Rev. W. D. D., article by, 502.
Barstow, the Rev. Z. S. D. D., article by, 115.
Beast, the name and the number of, article on, 36.
Benedict, by G. C. Child, noticed, 449.
Bernard, T. D.; Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament, noticed, 446.
Bible a book of facts, not of Modes and Philosophies, article on, 231.

Bible, early English translations of, 584.
Bible Pictures, by Rev. Dr. G. B. Ide noticed, 465.
Bible, Roman Catholic, translation of, 576.
Bigelow Papers, noticed, 142.
Blagden, The Rev. G. W. D. D., article by, 274.
Blessedness of the righteous Opened, article on, 559.
Bodow II. The Rev. J. C. D. D.; articles by, 390, 481.
Book of Psalms, noticed, 308.
Books, Miscellaneous, noticed, 144, 311, 472.
Botts, John M., The Great Rebellion, noticed, 309.
Breed, Rev. W. P., D. D., Home Songs for Home Birds, noticed, 311.
Briggs, Geo. N., Memoir, noticed, 139.
British Philosophy, Record, noticed, 468.
Bushnell's theories and Manichaeism, noticed, 55.

C.

Chadbourne, Prof., Lectures on Natural Theology, noticed, 459.
Charities, stimulated by the early church, 75.
Chemistry of the Farm and the Sea, by Dr. Nichols, noticed, 627.
Christ, The resurrection of, article on, 40.
Christ's Second Coming, by the Rev. David Brown, reviewed, 195.
Christendom in 1867, 147.
Church Literature, 150.
Church, the Early, and its Legacy to future Generations, article on, 65.
Church Union, 312.
Civic Crown, 316.
Civilization, aided by the Early Church, 88.
Clark, the Rev. Geo. H., article of, 99.
Clarke, J. F.; Orthodoxy, Its Truths and errors, noticed, 141.
Clark, the Rev. S. D., article by, 161.

Congregational Board of Publication, plans of, 175.
Congregational Colleges of England, article on, 372.
Congregational Literature, a present want of the d-nomination, article on, 161.
Congregational Review, Seventh vol., and New Plans, 146, 312.
 Congregational System, what, 165.
 Congregationalism, History of, by Punc-hard, noticed, 456.
 Congregational Works, Who publish them? 473.
 Constitutional Convention, by Jameson, noticed, 138.
 Coquerel's Transformation of Christianity, noticed, 627.
 Critics, the, 153.
Currier, the Rev. A. H., article by, 360.
Cutler, the Rev. E. D.D., article by, 1.
 Cutler, E. J., War Poems, noticed, 137.

D.

Daily Hymns, noticed, 303.
 Dale, Rev. J. W.: Classic Baptism, noticed, 463.
 Davis, Henry Winter: Speeches and Addresses, noticed, 467.
 Dickens, Works of, noticed, 456, 461.
 Dickens' Works, Illustrated, Pickwick Club, noticed, 305.
 Discob Hoste, 154.
Downey or Catholic Bible, article on, 576.
 Draytons and Davenants, noticed, 310.

E.

Ecce Deus, noticed, 458.
Ecce Homo, 634.
 England, Old, by J. M. Hoppin, noticed, 456.
English Congregational Colleges, article on, 372.
 Essays on Art, by Palgrave, noticed, 136.

F.

Fleming, the Rev. A., article by, 36.
 Flower de Luce, by Longfellow, noticed, 143.
 Forgiveness, its conditions, nature, and extent, 107.
 Freedom, advanced by the Early Church, 94.
 Froude, J. A., *History of England*, noticed, 307, 450.

G.

Gipsies, History of, by Simson, noticed, 128.
 God's Word Written: The Doctrine of Holy Scripture Explained and Enforced, by the Rev. Edward Garbet, noticed, 459.
 Gospels, Studies in the, by Trench, noticed, 468.

H.

Hayes, I. L.: Open Polar Sea, noticed, 462.
History, the Cycles of, article on, 521.
 History of the Christian Church, by Schaff, noticed, 468.
 Historical Inventions and Discoveries, 319.
 Holmes, N.: Authorship of Shakespeare, noticed, 143.
 Holmes, O. W., religious animus of, 245, 475.
Horford, Rev. B. F.: Memorial of, reviewed, 390.
 Household of Sir Thomas More, noticed, 625.
 Household Reading, from the Congregationalist, noticed, 308.
Howe, John: *Blessedness of the Righteous Opened*, article on, 559.
 Hymns, by Miss Kimball, noticed, 134.

I.

Independent, The, and our April number, 474.
 Indians ahead of the Spiritualists and Development Theorists, 478.
 Infant baptism among the Jews, 506.
 Infant baptism, objections noticed, 514.
Infant baptism, the Rationale of, article on, 1.

J.

Jacobus, M. W.: Notes on Genesis, noticed, 417.
 James v. 14, 15, Exgesis of, 115.
 Jameson, J. A., the Constitutional Convention, noticed, 138.
 Jaques Bonneval, noticed, 628.
 Justification and Sanctification, article on, 321.

K.

Kathrina, a Poem, by J. G. Holland, noticed, 629.
 Kimball, Harriet McEwen's, Hymns, noticed, 134.

L.

Lange's Commentaries on James, Peter, John and Jude, noticed, 458.
 Lange's Acts of the Apostles, noticed, 130.
Lanphear, The, Rev. O. T., article by, 53.
 Lea's Superstition and Force, noticed, 126.
Lecky's Rationalism, reviewed, 410.
 Lessing, G. E.: Life and Works of, noticed, 468.
 Lines, The, being drawn, 157.
 Longfellow, H. W.: Flower De Luce, noticed, 143.
 Longfellow's Poems Complete, noticed, 460.
Lord, John, LL.D., article by, 65.

Lord's Supper, The Neglect of, 314.
 Lowell, Prof.: Biglow Papers, noticed, 142.
 Luther, Martin, Life and Times of, noticed, 307.

M.

Macdonald's Annals of a Quiet Neighborhood, noticed, 297.
 Magoun, Rev. Geo. F., D.D., articles by, 107, 372.
 Manichaeism, 53.
 Market Assistant, by De Foe, noticed, 461.
 Martyrdom in the Early Church, 67.
 Masson, D.; Recent British Philosophy, noticed, 468.
 McCleland's Sermons, noticed, 628.
 McCosh's Examination of Mill's Philosophy, noticed, 131.
 McGhee's Expository Lectures on Ephesians, noticed, 626.
 Meetinghouse and the Ministry, article on, 411.
 Milton: Treasures from the Prose Writings of, noticed, 139.
 Ministering Children, noticed, 459.
 Moral Evil, Origin of, noticed, 310.
 Morgan, Henry: Ned Nevins, noticed, 303.
 Music of the Early Church, 92.

N.

Negro, the free enfranchisement of, article on, 254.
 New Birth, by A. Phelps, noticed, 141.
 Newton, Rev. Richard, D. D., Rills from the Fountain, noticed, 142.
 New Law, 636.
 Not Parallel Cases, 476.
 Notes from Books, Taylor's, reviewed, 215.
 Notes from Life, Taylor's, reviewed, 216.

O.

Oliphant, the Rev. D., article by, 231.
 Open Communion, noticed, 140.
 Oratory of the Pulpit, article on, 99.
 Ornithology and Oölogy of New England, by Samuels, noticed, 469.
 Orthodoxy; Its Truths and Errors, noticed, 141.
 Osgood, Samuel; American Leaves, noticed, 301.

P.

Pagan Writers, Modern, article on, 410.
 Palgrave, Essays on Art, noticed, 136.
 Parkman, Francis, Jesuits in North America, in the Seventeenth century, noticed, 470.
 Parton as Hercules, 157.
 Passages in the Life of the Faire Gospel-leader, Mistress Annie Askew, noticed, 305.

Paulding's, The Bulls and the Jonahs, noticed, 628.
 Percival's Life and Letters, article on, 20.

Pews, and a free Gospel, 541.
 Phelps, A., The New Birth, noticed, 141.
 Pictists of Germany, article on, 331.
 Politics, Theology in, article on, 107.
 Popery in Eclipse, 319.
 Pond's Lectures on Christian Theology, noticed, 672.
 Pond, the Rev. E., D. D., article by, 331.
 Popish Pretensions not abated, 432.
 Preachers demanded in our Day, and How to secure them, article on, 481.
 Preaching from within, article on, 360.
 Preaching in the Early Church, 78.
 Preaching to the poor, 541.
 Pissesen, Edmond De; The Redeemer, noticed, 468.

Principia Latina, by Smith, noticed, 134.
 Progress of Liberty, 156.
 Proselyte Baptism, 505.
 Proverbs, Book of, New Version and Notes, by J. Muenscher, D. D., noticed, 466.
 Pulpit Oratory, article on, 99.
 Puncard, Geo., History of Congregationalism, Vol. III, noticed, 466.

R.

Randolph, A. D. F.; Hopefully Waiting, and other verses, noticed, 310.
 Rankin, Rev. J. E., Gems for the Bridal Ring, noticed, 304.
 Reason, its Province in Biblical Interpretation, 231.
 Recamier, Madame; Memoirs and Correspondence of, noticed, 418.
 Remarkable Discovery, 317.
 Resurrection of Christ, article on, 40.
 Resurrection, The First, What is it? 193.
 Rev. xiii, 18, Exegesis of, 36.
 Rev. xx, Examination of, 196.
 Rich, The Rev. A. B., article by, 576.
 Richards, W. C., Memoir of Geo. N. Briggs, noticed, 139.
 Riverside Magazine, noticed, 143.
 Round Table, 146, 312, 473, 630.
 Rural Studies, with Hints for Country Places, noticed, 462.

S.

Sabellianism, The Logical Connections of, article on, 53.
 Samuels, Ed. A.: Ornithology and Oölogy of New England, noticed, 469.
 Sawtelle, H. A.: Open Communion, noticed, 140.
 Schaf, Rev. P., D. D., History of the Christian Church, noticed, 468.
 Schele De Vere; Studies in English, noticed, 305.
 Schenckel's Character of Jesus Portrayed, noticed, 290.
 Scriptures, Early Translations and Corruptions of, 576.

Second Advent of our Lord, article on, 195.
 Shaw, Thomas B.: *A Complete Manual of English literature*, noticed, 304.
 Shedd's *Commentaries and Pastoral Theology*, noticed, 622.
 Short Sermons, 119, 287, 412, 619.
 Simson's *Gipsies*, noticed, 128.
 Six Hundred Dollars a Year, noticed, 305.
 Smith, Goldwin, *Lectures on the Study of History*, noticed, 457.
 Smith's *Principia Latina*, noticed, 134.
 Smith, the Rev. J. Torry, article by, 195.
 South's *Sermons* noticed, 122.
 Spiritualists led by the N. A. Indians, 478.
 Spurgeon, C. H., *Morning by Morning*, noticed, 142.
 Stowe, Harriet Beecher: *Religious Poems* noticed, 311.
 Superstition and Force by Lea, noticed, 126.

T.

Talmud on baptism, 506.
 Taylor's, H. Hury, *Prose Works*, reviewed, 215.
 Taylor, Isaac: *Restoration of Belief*, noticed, 316.
 Tenny, The Rev. E. P., article by, 410.
Theology in Politics, article on, 107.
 The Statesman, Taylor's, reviewed, 215.
 Trench: *Studies in the Gospel*, noticed, 468.
 Tucker, The Rev. J. P., articles by, 20, 215, 290, 321.
 Tyler's *Theology of the Greek Poets*, noticed, 633.
 Tyndal, and his Translation of the Bible 585.

U.
 United States' History, by Bancroft, noticed, 124.

V.

Vinton, Rev. C. H., *Sermons*, noticed, 306.
 Vulgate Bible, 581.

W.

Walton, Isaac: *Complete Angler*, noticed, 302.
 War Poems, by E. J. Cutler, noticed, 137.
 Ward's *Life of Percival*, reviewed, 20.
 Warren, The Rev. W., article by, 341.
 Whitney, Mrs., *A Summer in Leslie Goldthwaite's Life*: noticed, 140.
 Whittier's *Tent on the Beach*, and other Poems, noticed, 298.
 Wicif, and his translation of the Bible, 581.
 Wesley Charles, and his Poems, noticed, 295.
 Will. *Theories of the*, article on, 341.
 Wines, E. C., D. D., *Essay on Temptation*, noticed, 143.
 Winthrop, John, *Life and Letters of*, reviewed, 274.
 Withington, The Rev. L., D. D., article by, 559.
 Woman, elevated by the Early Church, 97.
 Woman, the Jewels and Adornings of, 149.
 Women of the Gospels; The Three Wakings, and Other Poems, noticed, 300.
 Woodworth, The Rev. C. L., articles by, 254, 541.
 Wool-Gathering, by Gail Hamilton, noticed, 625.

